

# THE Divinity of Christ,

AND

Unity of the *Three* that bear Record in Heaven,

WITH

The blessed End and Effects of Christ's Appearance, coming in the Flesh,  
Suffering and Sacrifice for Sinners, confessed and vindicated,

By his followers, called *Quakers*.

And the principal matters in Controversie, between *Them*, and their present *Opposers* (as *Presbyterians, Independants, &c.*) Considered and Resolved,  
according to the Scriptures of Truth.

And more particularly to Remove the Aspersions, Slanders, and Blasphemies  
cast upon the People, called *QUAKERS*, and their Principles,  
in several Books, Written

By	{	<i>The Vincent</i>	} their sailing Book, still'd	{	Which are here examin'd and compared	
		<i>Will. Madox</i>				} <i>The Foundation, &amp;c.</i>
		<i>Tho. Danson</i> , his <i>Synopsis</i> ,				
		<i>John Owen</i> , his <i>Declaration</i> ,				

And their Mistakes, Errors, and Contradictions, both to themselves and  
each other, made manifest.

As also,

A short Review of several Passages of *Edward Stillingfleet's* (D.D. and Chaplin  
in Ordinary (so called) to his Majesty) in his Discourse of the Sufferings of  
Christ; And Sermon preached before the KING; wherein he stoutly Con-  
tradicts the said *Opposers*.

---

Mark 14. 56. For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed  
not together.

Coll. 2. 8. Beware lest any man spoil you through Philosophy and vain deceit.

1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5, 20. If any man consenteth not to the wholesome words of our Lord  
Jesus Christ, &c. he is puffed up, or proud, &c.

Acts 24. 14. After the way which they call Heresie, do I Worship the God of my Fa-  
thers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets, &c.

---

London, Printed in the Year. 1669.

# THE Divinity of Christ

by the Rev. John Owen, D.D.

in a Sermon, Preached at the Anniversary of the  
Church of England, in the City of London, on the  
21st of June, 1689.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Hebrews, &c.

And, *Paraphrase* on the Epistle to the  
Romans, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Galatians, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Ephesians, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Colossians, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Thimothee, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Titus, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Philemon, &c.

By the same Author, called, *Paraphrase*  
on the Epistle to the Hebrews, &c.



THE EPISTLE

*An Epistle to the Presbyterians, and  
Independants, and their Rough  
Hearers, who profess the Scriptures  
to be their Rule, whereby they are  
examined and tryed, and their Mayes  
discovered.*

**W**Hether do the Scriptures speak of Three Persons in the God-head, according to your own Rule, in these expresse words; let us see where it is written? Come do not shrinke, for we are resolved that the Scriptures shall buffet you about, and that you shall be whipped about with the Rule.

246. Where doth the Scripture speak of Christ's Righteousness imputed unto Unrighteous men, who live in their sins, and that in their Unrighteousness and Sins they shall live and die? Seeing that Faith purifies the heart from unrighteousness? And he that believes passes from Death to Life, and is from Sin that brought Death. And he that receives Christ, receives Righteousness itself by Faith in him, the Lord, the Righteousness, this is Scripture.

347. And where doth the Scripture say, That a man shall not be made free from sin? and that it is not attainable in this Life? Let us see where ever Christ, or the Prophets, or Apostles, preached this Doctrine? Give us plain Scripture, without adding or diminishing. For Christ's bids men be perfect; and the Apostle spoke Wisdom among them that were perfect.

444. You that deny Perfection, do ye not deny the One Offering, Christ Jesus, who hath perfected for ever them that are Sanctified? Do you not deny the Blood of Christ Jesus, in trampling it under your feet; and the Blood of the new Covenant; which Blood

## THE EPISTLE.

of Christ cleanse from all sin; and whose garments are made white by the Blood of the Lamb; and he thoroughly purges his floor with his Fan, and gathers his Wheat into his Garner.

71bly. And did Christ make Satisfaction for the sins of men; that they should live and die in their sins? for he came to save his People from their sins; and so he Died for them, that they should not live to them, but to God through him.

61bly. Where do the Scripture speak of a Trinity of distinct Persons, from *Genesis* to the *Revelation*? give us plain Scripture for it, without shuffling, adding or diminishing, you that talk so much of Scripture to be your Rule; for the Father, Word, and Spirit, this is owned according to Scripture, and they agree in One. And we charge you to give us a plain Scripture that saith there are three separate Persons; let us see Scripture, we will have Scripture for it, or otherwise be silent.

71bly. And where do the Scriptures say, That Christ the Light of the World (which enlighteneth every one that cometh into the World) is not sufficient to guide men to Salvation? Christ saith, Believe in the Light, that you may become Children of the Light, and Children of the Day; and who walk in the Light, there is no occasion of stumbling; And this is the Condemnation that Light is come into the World, and men love Darkness rather than Light, because their deeds be evil; And is not the Light sufficient, that lets a man see whether his deeds be wrought in God, read *John* 3.

81bly. Where doth the Scripture say, from *Genesis* to the *Revelation*, That the true Faith of God is without Works? Hath not Faith works that purifies the heart? Doth it not give Victory? Will you deny the Works of Faith, because the Works of the Law was denied by the Apostle?

91bly. Where doth the Scripture say, That it self is the Word of God? Do you not belye the Rule here? For, doth not the Scripture say, That Christ is the Word? and the Scriptures are Words: read *Exodus* 20, and *Revelation* 22. He that adds to these Words, and takes from these Words, the Plagues of God are added to him. So see whether you are not adders to these Words, as it is made appear before? And Christ saith, My words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and Life, &c. And in many places of Scripture God saith, My Words: Doth not Scripture signifie Writing? For all your high  
Schollar

## THE EPISTLE.

Schollar-ships, you may go to the *English School-Master*, and it will tell you what it signifies; What is all the writing in Peoples hearts? Is Paper and Ink in Peoples hearts? Come, do not cheat People, but confess truth; you affirm Scripture to be the Rule, but are found contrary to the Rule. But, what is all the Scripture the Rule, from *Genesis* to the *Revelations*, to walk by and practice? Or, what part of Scripture is the Rule? are *Herods* words, *Pharaohs* words, *Nebuchadnezzars* words, *Judas* words, the *Jews* words, *John Friends* words, the *Devils* words, the *Offerings* and the *Sacrifices* &c. Come, what part of Scripture is your Rule? Distinguish: For you say the Scripture is your Rule? Is it all a Rule for practice? Must we obey every title of it? for we own the Scriptures more than you do, which Holy Men of God gave forth, Christ Jesus, and the Apostles and Prophets; and they made a distinction, but you make none: Do not go with your Malice and envious minds, to possess the People, and say, That we disesteem the Scriptures, for we esteem Scripture more than you do, that have kept People under your Teaching, that they might be paying of you, and so make a Trade of them.

The Scriptures speaks plentifully concerning Christ being the Word of God: God is the Word, is not this Scripture? And in the Beginning was the Word, and all things were made by the Word: and, were all things made by the Scriptures? — And we say the Scriptures are a better Rule than your Directory; for if the Scriptures be the Rule, why do you set up a Directory to be your Rule? What! will you bore but Peoples eyes, that they shall not see how you dissemble: And why did you make a Church Faith as *Savoy* in eleven dayes time, if the Scriptures be your Rule? But it seems the Scriptures are not a sufficient Rule for you; but your Directory and your Church Faith, it seems, is your Rule; Scriptures are not sufficient to be your Rule. And, why do you deny Common Prayer, and set up a Directory and a Church Faith of your own making? And there, in your Directory, do you not set up your Imaginations and Meanings above Scriptures? Come, People will not sell their Wits, Reason, and Understanding: Come, People, you all know that when you come to discourse with these *Presbyterians* or *Independants* about Scriptures, who say it is their Rule, they will presently fall, and give it a meaning, and say it is their Opinion and Judge.

## THE EPISTLE.

Judgement, and conceive it to be so. — And lothen the *Presbyterians* and *Independants* Meanings, and Opinions, and Thinkings, and Conceivings, and Imaginations, and Judgements: this must be the Rule, and not the Scripture: then you must not take it at the Scriptures speak. The *Quakers* will take it Literelly, cry they, and these have been the *Presbyterian*, and *Independant* tricks, this long time. — What think you, do we not know your tricks? And so you would make People believe what an Esteem you have of Scriptures; when it is nothing but Meanings, and old Directory, and Church Faith! Do you think we have forgot your old Malice and Envie, when you haled above three thousand of us to Prison in the other Powers dayes, and persecuted to Death about thirty three, which stands upon Record to this day; whose Blood you have drinke, and mingled with your Sacrifice, and whose innocent Blood lies upon your heads; Was the Scripture your Rule to do thus? Nay, Christ bids you love Enemies, let Scripture be your Rule! Have you not been like *Judas*, and the Persecuting *Jews*, and the *Hierabrig* that Persecuted the true Christians? You have banished the Rule which is to love Enemies, and love one another: And Christ saith, freely ye have received, freely give: But you will not give freely, for you have not received freely; You will have the Club and the Bagge; For, what havock have you made of them, that could not put into your mouths! what Imprisoning and spoiling of Goods did you make when you had Power! this is not Gospels, this is besides the Rule! You are worse than the outward *Jewes*, for where did they ever take trouble/damages of them that did not hate them? It was time for the Lord to bring you down, who are judged by your own Rule, and you will not be moved, and you will not be moved.

*Lector*: And why do you belye the *Quakers*, with saying, That your good Works (that is of Ielfe) are the Meritorious Cause of Justification, and you say of your own, that it is not of our own Works, but of Christ Works, all our Works in his, and for him, who is our Justifier; G. F. hath sufficiently cleared this matter, and answered you, that you may say, that it is not of our own Works, but of Christ Works, all our Works in his, and for him, who is our Justifier.

*And where doth the Scripture say, The Works of Faith, and the Works of Grace, and the Fruits of the Spirit, are sinful? —* *replaye*: And where doth the Scripture hold forth the Sprinkling of Infants, and call it an Ordinance; and call of a Sacrament, and call

## THE EPISTLE.

it an Ordinance. Let us see Scripture for these things, and that the Apostles practised them as you do; and whether your practises were according to theirs? And have you the same Power and Spirit as they had that gave forth Scriptures? Answer plainly in plain words of Scripture, that you do not err from the Words and Rule which you say is your Rule. — But do you not remember, you *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, what havock you made of the Goods of the People of God, whom in scorn you called *Quakers*, because they would not pay for the Bread and Wine you eat and drink; you drunk it your selves, and eat it your selves, and made them Pay for it; did the Apostles ever do so, to spoyle any ones Goods, because they would not pay for their Bread and Wine they eat and drink? Come; let us see your Scripture, your Rule, which you boast so much of for these things, who make People believe it is your Rule; let us see a Rule for this: But you grumble, because you have not Power to fall upon the *Quakers*, to make them pay for your Bread and Wine you eat and drink, as you have done formerly; and when you have done, boast that Scripture is your Rule, and you say this is Gospel, this is Glad Tydings, is it? and then you spoyle their Goods for your Bread and Wine. Where were you in the time of Persecution? we could see but few of you then; for then you slunk into Holes and Corners, & hid out your Scourges; and now when you have a little Liberty, what a bawling you make against *Quakers*? You are a little hungry bitten, because you have not Tythes, and Easter Reckonings, and Midsummer Dues, and Money of the *Quakers* for your Bread and Wine; will you avenge yourself of the *Quakers*?

13thly. And do you not say, That your Sanctification, and Justification, and your Prayers, and Graces, and Faith, all are imperfect? (as manifest in you) Is not Christ Justification, and Sanctification? And must you not Pray in the Spirit of God? And is it not perfect? What darknes is this! Must not Christ be in you? And, is not he in you? and Faith in you? and the Spirit of God in you to Pray by? And so if it be imperfect, then it is your own Praying, and your own Justification, and Sanctification, and Faith, and Application; it's of your own making, and not Christ's; for Christ is perfect, who Sanctifies and Justifies, and his Spirit is perfect.

Priest



## THE EPISTLE.

Priest *Danson*, *Presbyterians*, how now! Dost thou not bring *Cardinal Pool*, and *Aquinas*, and *Aristotle*, to prove thy Assertions, and thy Imaginations? it seems Scripture is not sufficient: Thou wouldst make People believe, that the *Presbyterians* were against the *Papists* and *Heathen* both; but now they must be the *Presbyterians* Patrons, and yet could make People believe that the Scriptures were their Rule; but this must be their Rule, the *Papists* and the *Heathen*: Read *Danson's Synopsis* of his *Quakerism*, what a bundle of Lyes he hath drawn up together; he may take them home to himself.

14thly. And why do you *Presbyterians* cry against the *Quakers* Light, which is Christ, as being but an *Heathenish* light? and now to oppose them, you are fain to run to the *Heathen*, and to the *Papists*, to find Arguments; and then tell People the Scripture is your Rule (O Deceit!)

15thly. Where doth the Scripture speak of an *Humane* Nature of Christ in Heaven? Is not Christ and his Body Glorified, and he the Lord from Heaven; for is not Christ's Nature Divine, and his Soul Divine, which comes out from God? And where is his Soul called *Humane*? Come to the *Accidences* again, thou that professest thy self to be a great Schollar, tell us what *Humane* signifies.

16thly. Thou speaks of Three Persons; and a man is a Person; What doest thou infer from this? Is God a Man? No, he is a Spirit, I tell thee the Scripture sayes so: Is the Holy Ghost a Man? It is call'd the Holy Spirit; and Christ was a man, the man Christ Jesus. — So it seems the *Presbyterians* can say little of himself, but he hath learned something of the Learned *Wotton*, in pag. the second, but he doth not tell us what he is, whether a *Papist* or an *Heathen*.

17thly. Thou sayest the Soul is part of man's Nature; Where doth the Scripture, thy Rule, say so? For the Scripture saith, *God breathed into man the breath of Life, and man became a Living Soul.*

18thly. Thou sayest the word Person cannot properly be attributed to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: Why doth the *Presbyterians* rage so against the *Quakers*? It seems you cannot agree among your selves; because the *Quakers* speak as the Scriptures do, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and say the Scripture doth not speak of Three Persons, as thou thy self in thy third page sayes the word Person cannot properly be attributed to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.



## THE EPISTLE.

**Ghost:** See how this man is in Confusion, who saith sometimes there are Three separate Persons; and another while, the word Person cannot properly be attributed to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: But we do charge *Danson*, and his Brethren, to make this good by Scripture in plain words; — For the Scripture saith, *The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from them.* — So how can you say they are separated, when they are one in another? but it shews you have little knowledge of God, or Scriptures either.

**19thly.** The Priest saith concerning that distinction in the God-head, it cannot be apprehended by us; — and yet he will call them Three separated Persons, and a Trinity; and gives them Names which are not apprehended by you; you might have been silent then in what you did not apprehend: And yet you will lay Principles down concerning God, the Son, and Spirit, which you do not apprehend your selves, but presume above what is written, and so go contrary to your Rule. — Should you not call the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as the Holy Men did call them in the Scriptures?

**20thly.** In the 4th page thou sayest, The Father, the Son, and the Spirit, are said to be Three, yet but one God; and yet thou sayest we do not know what to call those Three, but Three Persons; and there is that ascribed to them (thou sayest) Properties, which agree not simply.

**Ans.** The Father, Son, and Spirit agree; but that which you do ascribe, do not agree with Scripture with them, nor among your selves about them. — And if you do not know what to call the Father, Son, and Spirit, but Three Persons, you might have holden your Tongues then, till you did know, who calls them and gives them Names contrary to Scriptures, and the Holy Men of God, who called them Father, Son, and Spirit, who were wiser Men than any of you.

**21thly.** And again, in thy 4th page thou sayest Thre Subsistents (that is Persons, though not strictly, yet proportionably, or Analogically so called) in the God-head.

People! Did you ever hear such a Mash? We do charge this *Presbyterian* to make these words good by plain Scripture, viz. Three Subsistents, Three Persons, and Analogically; Is this a Scripture word People? Where did the Apostles use any such dark words? Hadst thou

## THE EPISTLE.

thou not this word from the *Heathens*? Well, Mark Reader, he sayes there are Three Persons, and Three Subsistents in the God-head; and hath not he made Four? If there be Three in the God-head he hath made Four; for, what is the God-head? God is One, and he hath made Three besides; see *pag. 4.* of his Book. — And so, in the *Title* of his Book, he speaks of Three Persons in the God-head; Are there not Four then? And in the said 4th *page*, he sayes, he thinks he hath answered all the Arguments of the *Antitrinitarians*; he doth but think so, it seems.

*Ans.* The Scripture saith, *1 Joh. 5. 7.* That there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. But he doth not say that they are separated nor distinct, neither doth call them Persons. — And thus we call them, as the Scriptures call them, Father, Word, and Holy Ghost; and the Apostle doth not say they are separate, nor distinct; and we are not to presume above what is written. —

We charge you, *Presbyterians*, to give us printed Scriptures for these following words; and let us see in what Chapter and Verse they are printed; Come to the Rule, and do not presume above what is written: *Concrete, Abstract, Predicate, the Relative, Co-eternity, Co-essentiality, Co-equality, Communication of Properties, Co-essentialities, Modalities, Suppositualities, Incommunicable Substances, and Hypostatical Unions.* — Come, are these words spoken in the Rule, the Scriptures? let us see the Chapter and Verse, that we may see where such terms are spoken of the Father, Word, and Spirit, which are one; Had you not them rather from your old Logical and Philosophical Books? And have not they been your Rule for such words, and not the Scriptures, which the Holy men of God spoke forth.

Thou sayest in the 12th *page* of thy Book, That we must not take Man here for a Person, but a Nature, as you do God, &c. And yet before, thou saidst, That Man was a Person; and so it is the Nature that is a Person, and not the Man, nor God: but thou hast not defined to us what a Person is, nor what the word Person signifies, for all thy Schollar-ship. — And thou sayest, Ye mean no more then the Name Man to be attributed to *Peter, James, and John*; because the same humane Nature specifically agrees unto them; and so is the Name God attributed to each Person, because the same Divine Nature subsists in each of them.

*Ans.*

## THE EPISTLE.

*Ans.* This is a dark thing, to whom will you liken me, with God? [like *Peter, James, and John*, or like unto some corrupt person] The Saints were partakers of the Divine Nature; What do you say of them therefore; And where do the Scriptures speak that the Nature of God is so simple, &c. where learned you this word? And where doth the Scripture use these words *Accidents* and *Integrals* of the God-head? and this is your Conceptions and Notions of God, and the Word, and the Spirit, as it's said in the 13th page of *Danſon's* Book; It's a Conception and Notion indeed: — For you say in the same 13th page, The Conception or Notion that we have of the Father, &c. so it's but a Notion and Conception, it seems, that you have of the Father; — and then sayes (suppose) as a subsistent, or Person, &c. But which of these terms it is, this Notionist hath not declared to us in his 13th page; — And this Notionist goes on in the said 13th page, and sayes, Nor can we say that the Notion of the Father, as one Person in the God-head, includes the Son; nor the Notion of the Son, as one Person in the God-head, includes the Father.

Reader, Didst thou ever hear the like! This is but a Notion of the Father, and a Notion of the Son indeed. — And are these *Presbyterian* Priests like to interpret Scripture with their Notions, Conceptions, and Suppositions; no, no. No one knows the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him; — Nor none knows the Son but the Father; and to know God, and Jesus Christ, is Life Eternal; and none can call him Lord but by the Holy Ghost. — And so this Knowledge is beyond all your false Conceptions, Suppositions, and Notions; And if the Holy Ghost, the Saints bodies be the Temple of it, which Holy Ghost leads them into all Truth: And if the Holy Ghost be a Person, then have not the Saints a Person in their bodies? And why did not the Apostle say, That their bodies were the Temples of a Person, according to your Doctrine and Rule, — the Holy Ghost is a Spirit, — and so let us see that Scripture which gives the Holy Ghost the Name of a Person.

And he speaks again in his 14th page of Three distinct Persons are one with the God-head; — Now Reader, is not here Four? to wit, Three Persons and the God-head; But Reader, we charge him to give us Chapter and Verse for this Doctrine, for we must order him with the Rule.

## THE EPISTLE.

And then he tells us of a Notion of the Father and including the Son; it's but his own Notion; — for if he had known him he would have spoken in a form of sound words, whereby he might not have been reproved.

And again, the *Presbyterian* sayes, the Three Persons are distinct, and the Rule is to be understood that they are One among themselves only in respect of that, wherein they agree not simply.

*Ans.* Reader take notice, he sayes, The Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, which he calls Three Persons, doth not agree simply; Is not this contrary to Scripture? What agreement is this which is not simply? What! separate distinct Persons, not agreeing simply! — Come, what is this agreement then, if it be not an agreeing simply? Tell us what it is by Chapter and Verse; thou sayes the Scripture is the Rule?

Where doth the Scripture say, That the Father, Son, and Spirit doth not agree simply? — Didst thou not say, That God was so simple, that he admitted of no parts; what agreement is this if it be not simple? What is it then? tell us.

Dost thou not abuse the Father, Son, and Spirit, and Scriptures? clear thy self; and make this good; That the Father, Son, and Spirit doth not agree simply; if not simply, then tell us how; and give Chapter and Verse for it out of the Scriptures, or else acknowledge thy self to be of a *Sandy Foundation*.

Seeing thou sayst, A Man is a Person, and God is a Person; and the Scripture saith God is a Spirit, and Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, the begotten of the Father.

Was Christ the Image of the Father, as he was of the Generation of *Abraham*, or *David*, or *Adam*? or according to the *Spirit*? — Whether of these was he the express Image of his Father's substance, because thou calls the Father a Person; — And the Scripture sayeth, He suffered according to the Flesh, — which he did not die as he was God; and the Scripture calls him Son of Man, and Son of God, and he being the express Image of his Fathers substance; see the Old Translations.

And dost thou not, in thy 16th page of thy *Synopsis*, bring the Greek Philosophers to prove the Persons? Yes: How now *Presbyterian* Priest, thou hast run beside thy own Directory and Scripture both, but the Greek Philosophers must be thy Rule, and Leader, surely.

## THE EPISTLE.

surely People will not always have their Eyes blinded by you, Christ is come to open them.

And in the 17th page of his Book, the *Presbyterian* saith, that *Hypostasis* must be rendred Person, or Subsistent, or some word to that Effect, he sayes. —

So People see: it must be some word, but what it must be he knows not; and so in this manner they are giving Names to Christ and God, besides the Rule of Scripture; we charge thee shew us a Verse in Scripture that speak such Language, and where one word may be put for another by *Metalepsis*? and so leave People in Doubts and Questions; you are going beside your Scripture and Rule, that at last People shall not know what to call God and Christ. — So the *Presbyterians* and *Independants* must give us Scripture; For we will not be satisfied with your Notions, and Whymfies, and false Conceptions, which you have from *Aristotle*, and the *Greek Philosophers*, and the *Papists*, and *Cardinals*; We do command you to give us Scripture, Chapter, and Verse, *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, for these things plainly, — seeing you are of late perked up in a way of scolding against us (not like the Holy Men of God, Patient and Meek, and apt to Teach) as you may see in the latter end of your Brother *Vincens*'s Book; Is that the Language of a Christian? No; He hath declared what spirit you are of, *Rabshakeb*'s spirit, railing, and speaking evil of the way of Truth; he thinks to overcome by Railing, and complaining, not by Love; nay, the Lamb must have the victory.

Whether or no was Christ's Blood shed for All men, and by it Justifies All men, they living in their sins, and not believing in it; are they saved by their saying they believe in the Blood, and not believing in the Light (which Christ Commands) and become Children of the Light; and they say they believe, and yet not pass from Death to Life, and from sin that brings Death? And whether or no any are cleansed from all sin by the Blood of Christ, but such as walk in the Light of Christ, as in 1 *Joh. 1*. And so whether or no are those Justified who believe not in the Light of Christ, nor pass from Death to Life, nor walk not in the Light, whether or no are those Justified by Christ's Blood, and have not the Testimony of Justification in them, as in the accompt to God Christ's Blood was shed for All men; but for a man to come to partake of this Justification, is it not to feel the Blood sprinkling the Heart and Conscience? — For the out-ward

## THE EPISTLE.

ward *Jews* in the Figure, had Blood sprinkled upon them in the outward Offerings; — Come answer us by Scripture? Do not daub up People with untempered Mortar; do you know the Mortar that is tempered?

Whether or no was Christ an Offering for the sins of the whole World, and died for the sins of the whole World?

Whether or no all the sinners and ungodly of the whole World are justified by his Death, and by his offering up once for all? answer in plain words.

And whether or no you will make a Sect, that he died for some ungodly and some sinners only; for the sons of *Adam* were the sinners and ungodly: But he that believes, is born of God, and they receive Christ, and he gives them Power to become the sons of God, and they know he died for them, and have the Testimony of it, and have the Benefit of his Death and Resurrection.

And what was the Light that shined in the Darkness, and the Darkness comprehended it not?

What was the Spirit that the Wicked grieved, vexed, and quenched? Where is it? and what is the Spirit of Truth that reproves the World of sin? Where is it that leads the Saints into all Truth? Come, we must have plain Scripture for these things.

What is the Law that God will write in the Heart, and put in the Mind, that all shall know Him from the greatest to the least, that they shall not every one teach his Brother; and shall all know the Lord?

What is that Light that shines in the Heart, to give the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus? 2 Cor. 4.

What is the Word of God in the Heart the Apostle Preached, and the People was to obey it, and do it?

And what was that Rule that *Adam* had, and all the Holy Men in the Old World?

And what was the Rule of *Enoch's* Faith, by which he was translated? And *Abraham's* Faith, who obeyed God, and forsook his Country? — Answer these things by Scripture, because you say, The Writings (the Scriptures) are the Rule of Faith.

And *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, have you forgotten all your *Petitions* and *Addresses* you Petitioned and made to the other *Powers* against the *Quakers*? If you have forgotten them, read *William*

*Caton's*



# THE EPISTLE.—

10

Caton's Book of your Petitions and Addresses gathered up and down the Nation. What you said of *Oliver* and *Richard*, and how the People of God, in scorn called *Quakers* (the first beginning of calling them so, was at *Darby*, by one *Bennet* an *Independant*, about 19 year since) and then when the People called *Quakers* were gathered together in divers places to Worship God, then you said they were Plotting together against *Oliver* (whom some of you called the Light of your Eyes, and breath of your Nostrils) to bring in King *Charles*; and *Oliver* said, *We would not hurt a Mouse*, at that time, though he did cast many of us in Prison, through you, after that; and then you Baptized us in your Prisons by cruel sufferings. Of all men — you should hold your Tongues in bawling so against us, seeing the Light of your Eyes, and breath of your Nostrils is gone; — And what, was it not through some of you, That the Act against *Sturdy Beggars* came forth? upon which, Friends at that time could hardly travel three or four miles from their own Houses, but they were Whipped, men worth three or four-score pounds, or an hundred a year, were Whipped for Beggars and Vagrants; — And then did you not get another Act, That we must not speak to you in going or coming from a Steeple-house? And how Friends were thronged in Prison up and down in the Nation by you? Answer these *Queries*.

And thus you may see what a Havock you made in your Day; but when Persecution came, you durst hardly look out with your heads your selves.

And was there ever the like known, or seen, how your Brethren turns from North to South, and from South to North; and there they can turn, and chop, and change; — And yet you could tell us then, That the Common-Prayer was Hell, and Egyptian Bondage. — And we could hardly have a Meeting, but you were incensing the Rulers against us, That we were Plotting to bring in King *Charles*; and how many in those dayes were put in Prison upon that account by you, because we went to Meetings? We can tell you, we have a List of them; — And yet the *Quakers* were House Creepers (said you) when you had gotten the Mals-houses, and Tythes, and your Easter-Reckonings, and Midsummer-Dues, and straining our Goods for your Bread and Wine; — And who are become the House Creepers now? — Then you had gotten the

## THE EPISTLE.

the old Mals-houses. Oh ! your filchiness comes to be made manifest to all men, and you have made your selves ridiculous ; who are fighting against an innocent People, that wishes hurt to no man, but the good of all men. And do you think that the Lord will not remember and reckon with you for all these things ? Dare you look into the Book of your Actions and Consciences, and see what is written there, and see if they be not Recorded.

How now *Presbyterians*, *High Priests* ! What, is this your Doctrine that you now Preach up, for your Hearers, to go to a *Bawdy-house*, as *Thomas Vincent* speaks ? What Liberty here, do you give to Youth, and your Hearers ? who sayes, *It's worse to go to the Quakers Meetings, than to a Bawdy-house* : You pleaded for a body of sin as long as you live, but now it's com'd out indeed, when you plead for a *Bawdy-house* rather than *Quakers Meetings* ; it's like the *Presbyterian* Priest knows where they are, it appears, as if he thought more of a *Bawdy-house*, than of Christ and Verrue.

So it's clear here, you are Them that turn the People to Vice, and from the Lord and his Truth (*Elimas* like) seeking to pervert ; For the *Quakers Meetings* are in the Fear, and Power, and Spirit of God, who meet together in the Name of Christ Jesus ; so it's like you love Meetings at *Bawdy-houses*, more then the Meetings of the People of God ? who meet to Worship God. And if this be your Doctrine, then you must enlarge your *Brothel* and *Bawdy-houses*, as they do at *Rome*, *Legorn*, and *Venice*, and other parts in *Italy* ; and then they will give you Tythes, and Easter-Reckonings, and Midsummer-Dues ; For, have you not called *Bawdy-house* People, good Church Members ? And have you not taken Tythes of them ? And would you not say, *The Peace of God* to them, for paying you Tythe ?

Who would have thought, that we should have had such Unvirtuous Expressions from the *Presbyterians*, that this stinking favour should have lyen covered under their Weeds ; — Well, the *Quakers* must Declare against all your *Bawdy-houses*, which thou, *Vincent*, sayes, Thou hadst rather thy People should go to, than to the *Quakers Meetings*, where the Word of God is Preached ; — And so *Presbyterians*, if this be your Doctrine to your People, to send them to *Bawdy-houses*, rather then to send them to a Meeting of the People of God ; we utterly deny you, and your *Bawdy-house* too.

And

And is it not a shame to put in Print, to tell the World, That thou wouldst rather have thy People go to a *Bawdy-house*, than to a *Quakers Meeting*? For it's like, if thou wilt set up that House, thou mayst have a yearly Revenue (like thy Father the Pope) out of your *Bawdy-houses*; it's like, if you were there, you might get some gain, if you had *Bawdy-houses*; but if you go to the People of God's Meetings, then you will get no gain. Well might *William Pen* say the Priest prayed whiningly, and looked pale, when you had lost your Easter-Reckonings, and Midsummer-Dues. — Is not the Great Balcon holden at Door? What, this is a new way? Is it? Whether brings in more profit to the Priests mouths, Tythes, and Easter-Reckonings, and Midsummer-Dues, or the Great Platter? Now do you not cry up *Bawdy-houses*, or any way, so that you can get gain?

I wonder for all this idle time you have had, that you could not Answer *Samuel Fisher's* Book amongst you, for it stands upon your heads; he hath Answered all your Principles, and more then you have questioned: Have you forgot your Regiment of Fighting Priests? and how the *Presbyterians* and *Priests* beat the *Quakers*? Read the Book of *Fighting Priests*, how they tore the Cloaths off Lasses and young Men, and drew their Rapiers upon them, and broke their heads, and shed their blood, and yet you must have the Title of *Gospelers*, but more like unto *raging Heathens*, who imagine vain things against God, and Christ, and his People; but the Lord hath broken your horn, the wild beast, and put him under a chain: So we looked you would have given out a Book of Repentance for all your wicked Actions in the other Powers' days, and shewed forth a work of Reformation; Do you not remember how you came with your Drums and Fiddles?

*Independants* and *Presbyterians*, Is it not clear here to all People, That you deny God, and Christ, and the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, in your saying, That God hath ordained some Persons to be damned, when God saith, *Ezek. 18. 32. He desires not the death of him that dieth.* And in *Isa. 1. 18.* it's said, *Come let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; and though they be red like crimson, they shall be like wool:* And, *vers. 16. Wash ye, make ye clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes, cease to do evil, learn to do well.* — And the Apostle saith, in *1 Tim. 2. 4.* *God would have all men to be saved;*

## THE EPISTLE.

and to come to the knowledge of the Truth; And Christ hath given himself a Ransom for all, to be testified in due time; And Christ tasted death for every man, and is a Propitiation for the sins of the whole world. And his Blood was shed for all men. And the Gospel is to be Preached to every Creature; And, Go and teach all Nations, Matth. 28. Now is it not clear, That these Presbyterians and Independants, who say, That Christ died but for some, and offered but for some; Have they not denied Christ's Blood for all men, and his Propitiation for all men? — And in doing this, they deny God's Will, who would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the Truth. And would they not lay the fault in God, when the fault is in man by not believing? And do they not make Seeds here, in saying he died but for some, and would have but some to be saved, and he shed his Blood but for some. — And the Scripture saith, That all are gone astray, both Jew and Gentile, that he might have mercy upon All: See Rom. 11. 32. And they say, That he will not have mercy upon all; and do not you say, That he will have mercy upon some? contradicting the Apostle and the Rule. — For the Scripture saith, Christ enlighteneth every man that cometh into the World; and you say that he enlighteneth but some. — And the Scripture saith, That the grace of God that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared to all men; and you say, The Grace of God that brings Salvation, hath appeared but to some, and all have not received Grace. And the Scripture saith, God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son into the World, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life: — And do not you say he gave him but for a few, and loved some of the World? And, do not you Contradict Scripture, and God, and Christ, and the Prophets and Apostles words, and so are found in an Eironious Principled Spirit? — And so, is it not clear, that you deny Christ, who died without the Gates at Jerusalem, whose Blood was shed for all men, and denies the Propitiation and Attonement for all men, and denies Jacob's Prophecy, who prophesied, That the gathering of all Nations shall be to Shilo. — And you say, That some of the Nations shall be saved, not all; and here, do you not deny the very Scripture it self, and God, and Christ, and the Prophets and Apostles words, and denies their Doctrine? And also, Is it not clear that you deny the true Faith of God's Elect, that the Just lives by? And is not Faith the Gift of God? And do you not say, That Faith is not perfect?

# THE EPISTLE.

perfect? Do not you hold Justification without, and that it is without Man and Woman? And doth not Faith heal? See *Mark*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and the *Acts*. And was not the Church Established in the Faith? *Acts* 16. 5. Is it not called the Righteousness of Faith? *Rom.* 4. 13. And how that the Saints are Heirs by Faith, and it is called the Word of Faith, *Rom.* 10. — And it is called the Spirit of Faith, *1 Cor.* 4. 13. *Gal.* 5. 6. and Faith that works by Love. — So it's clear, that you are out of this Faith, that lives in malice and hatred. — And the Scripture speaks of one Faith, one Baptism, *Eph.* 4. and the Unity is in the Faith, and Faith gives Victory over that which hath separated from God. — And Faith is the Shield. — And the Saints was to strive together for the Faith of the Gospel, *1 Thes.* 3. Remember your work of Faith, and put on the breastplate of Faith, *1 Thes.* 5. 8. The work of Faith with Power, and holding Faith and a good Conscience, *1 Tim.* 5. 19. And have not you made shipwreck of this Faith in Christ Jesus, and God, to say Christ's Blood was not shed for *all men*, and God would not have *all men to be saved*, and hath ordained *some* to damnation? Is not Faith called a Mystery, *1 Tim.* 3. 9. Were not the Saints to fight the good Fight of Faith, *1 Tim.* 6. 12. — Are not you among them that have erred concerning the Faith, and have overthrowen the Faith of some in not believing the one Offering once for *all*, his Blood for *all*, his Death for *all*, and so are become Reprobates concerning the Common Faith, *Tit.* 1. 4. — And without Faith it is impossible to please God, who is the Author and Finisher of our Faith; — which you made yours at *Savoy* in eleven dayes time, in *Oliver's* dayes. — And the Just shall live by his Faith, *Heb.* 2. and hearts purified by Faith, *Acts* 15. — and Sanctified by Faith, *Acts* 26. *Rom.* 3. a man is Justified by Faith. — So it's clear, Reader, that Faith Justifies, Sanctifies, — and Faith purifies the heart, and so this Justification is within, and the Mystery of Faith is held in a pure Conscience, and the Conscience must be within, must it not Reader? And so here thou mayst see how these *Presbyterians* and *Independants* have erred from the Apostles Doctrine. — And in *Rom.* 5. and being Justified by Faith, — by whom we have access to God by Faith, and Justified by Faith in Christ Jesus, *Gal.* 2. And the Apostle saith, I live by the Faith of the Son of God, — and the Just lives by Faith, — by grace you are saved through Faith, *Eph.* 2. 8. *Luk.* 2. 5. thy Faith hath saved thee.

## THE EPISTLE.

And do not the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* deny Christ's Doctrine who deny Perfection; — both the Doctrine of God, and the Command of Jesus Christ, and the Ministry of Christ Jesus, and makes void all the Apostles Exhortation? — For God said to *Abraham*, *Walk before me and be thou perfect*, Gen. 17. — And do they not deny the way of God which is perfect, *Psal.* 18. 30. And the Law of the Lord is perfect; and Christ saith, Every one that is perfect, shall be as he is; — And, *be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect*, Mat. 5. And *Noah* was a perfect man, Gen. 6. Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord: He hath made my way perfect, 2 Sam. 20. *Job* was a perfect man, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil, *Job* 1. 1. God will not cast away the perfect man. —

— Now, do you not say there is no Perfection? Do you not give the Scripture the lye? God made my way perfect, *Psal.* 18. Mark the perfect man, *Psal.* 37. And the Wicked may shoot at the perfect, *Psal.* 64. And are not you them that shoot at the perfect with your dirty Arrows? And Christ prayed, That they may be perfect in one, *Job.* 17. Is not Christ's Prayer to be fulfilled, or did he pray in vain? Will you deny his Prayer you vain men? Is not Christ's Prayers available? — The Apostle said, He *spoke wisdom among them that were perfect*. — ye false Ministers say there are none perfect. God comforts his People, and Ministers, and sayes, *His strength is made perfect in their weakness*. Herein is encouragement to Perfection by God's Ministers, *Be perfect, be of good comfort*; but you say none can be perfect, and so you are miserable Comforters. — And the Work of the Ministry, *Eph.* 4. was to bring People to the knowledge of God, to a perfect man, and to the measure and stature of the fulness of Christ; — And are not you false Ministers, and evil workers, who say there is no Perfection, you cannot bring them, it seems, to a perfect man, you cannot bring them to the measure of the stature of Christ, — but runs up and down, and fetches all the weaknesses of the Saints, and applies them, to People to hold up Imperfection to them, as *Paul*, *Peter*, *John* and some others, 2 Cor. 13. We wish your Perfection, and *Heb.* 6. let us go on to Perfection. — And *Col.* 2. the bond of Perfection. — So is it not clear here whose Ministers you are? — neither according to God; nor Christ, nor according to the Scriptures, nor according to the Prophets nor Apostles. — By one Offering, he hath Perfected, for ever, them that are Sanctified. —

— And



## THE EPISTLE.

—And what *Hes*, is this, but Christ Jesus? — And now it's clear, That you deny this Faith that Sanctifies; — and that you deny this one Offering (mark) for ever, them that are Sanctified. — And so it's clear, That you deny the one Offering of Christ Jesus without the Gates of *Jerusalem*; — and sayes, That none are perfect, and no Perfection here: — You may as well say there is no Faith here.

— And you that say also there is no Overcoming here, you may as well deny Belief here; for, *he that believes is born of God, and he that is born of God overcomes the World*; — and greater is he that is in you; than he that is in the World. So it is manifest, That you have not this greater Birth in you to overcome the World; and here you stand against all the Believers, and all the household of Faith, which Faith gives Victory; — And you say there is no Victory here; — And so, what can you cry up but sin, and *Bawdy-houses*? And you would rather have your People go into *Bawdy-houses*, then to go to the household of Faith, which preaches down Sin, and Imperfection: — For God is perfect, his Way is perfect; and he bids, be perfect: — And the Ministers was to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus, see *Col.* And you Preach up Imperfection for term of Life, so Ministers of Satan; — for the Devil made man imperfect, Christ makes them perfect; and God made them perfect, and said, *Be perfect*. So are you not all the blind Guides that leads into the ditch, which is a corrupted place, that People are corrupted, not perfect; but the true Ministers presented them perfect in Christ Jesus. — And so, is it not clear, That you deny the Blood of Christ, and trample it under your feet? — For, *Christ Sanctifies his People with his own Blood*, Heb. 10. *The Blood of Christ Jesus cleanseth from all sin*, 1 Joh. 1. & Rev. And *he hath washed us from our sins in his Blood*; And *they overcame by the Blood of the Lamb*; And, *whose Garments were made white by the Blood of Jesus*. And do you not give the Apostle, and the Scriptures the Lye, and makes Christ's Blood of none Effect; — And sayes, They are not made white, they are not cleansed from all sin, and that they must have a body of sin and death as long as they live, and that they are not Redeemed to God. — Do you not make the Blood of Christ of none effect here? — which is to wash and to cleanse away that which is brought into *Adam* by the Serpent, and deny Christ's Purchase, who purchased his People, and Justifies by his Blood, and Redeemed through his Blood; And what Redemption is this, and

Purchase

## THE EPISTLE.

Purchase is this, and Justification is this, if they be not Redeemed out of sin, and evil, and old *Adam*; Christ hath Redeemed us to God through his Blood, *Rev. 5. Eph. 1.* Are not you them that have counted the Blood of the new Covenant of none effect, *Heb. 10.* and trodden it under foot, wherewith he Sanctifies, and so are they that have done despite against the Spirit of Grace; for do you not say, the Spirit of God is not given to every man to profit withal; — only some have the Spirit say you; — Who are they then, that *waxes it, and quenches it, and grieves it?* — And were not they wicked People whom the Lord gave his good Spirit to, to instruct them, *Nehem. 9.* they were such as rebelled against *Nehemiah*. And here it is clear, That you make Sects, and denies the Prophets and Apostles Doctrine. — And you say, That Christ doth not enlighten every man that cometh into the World; Do you not here deny *John's* Doctrine, and Scriptures, and Christ himself, who saith *He is the Light of the World.* — And deny that which People should believe in, — *believe in the Light, that you may become Children of the Light,* as in *Joh. 14.* — And deny that which should give People the Knowledge of the Light that is in their hearts, *the Light of Jesus,* *2 Cor. 4.* — And so People see what these men can Preach, that deny true Faith, true Belief, true Apostles, and Scripture, and the Blood of Christ, and the Offering; and so denies God, and Christ, and his Commands; and Preach up Sin, and Imperfection, and the *Bawdy-house*; and would have his Hearers rather go to a *Bawdy-house*, than to go among the People called *Quakers*, that Preaches up Perfection, and the Blood of Jesus, the One Offering, that makes People perfect, and Sanctifies them; and must not People have Faith in them, and Christ in them, and the Blood in them sprinkling their Hearts and Consciences? Reader, I pray thee read the Scriptures, for they were given forth to be read, and believed; and not for *Presbyterians* and *Independants* to make a Trade of them, and keep People alwayes to be hearing them, and paying of them; the Holy Men of God did not give forth the Scriptures for that end, that suffered many of them, to death, for giving them forth: And so I pray thee, Reader, do not sell thy Wit and Reason any longer; for they will put it up all in their Pokes and Bags, and then lead them into a ditch, and barren Mountain, and so feed themselves of you, and not feed you: But the Lord is come to gather his People from off the barren Mountains, and from their mouths

## THE EPISTLE.

mouſhs that have fed themſelves and not the Flock, and ſought themſelves and not the Flock; and made a Prey upon you, and ſought for your wooll, & hath bit you when you put not into their mouths; and have ſought for handfuls of Barley, and a piece of Bread; and hath born rule amongſt you by their means; and hath been the greedy dumb Dogs that could never have enough, — who have been ſlumbering. — Read *Jer. 5. 1ſa. 56. Mic. 3. Ezek. 14.* and ſo read how Chriſt marks out thoſe falſe Teachers, *Mat. 23.* And the Apoſtle to *Timothy* and *Titus*. — So no more, but my Love, that you may all come to know the Freedom in Chriſt, from all the blind Guides.

G. F. Jo. Stubbs.

If that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt be three diſtinct ſeparate Perſons, not ſimply One, or agreeing ſimply, as the Priſt ſaith, then how far diſtance are they from one another? ſhew us Chapter and Verſe for this, and make it good by Scriptures.

And let us ſee through all the Scriptures, where ever the Holy Men of God did give ſuch Titles or Names to God, and Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt, as the *Preſbyterian* and *Independant* have done; as may be ſeen in this Book.

The Scripture ſaith, That God, and Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt will dwell in Man; & then you *Independant* & *Preſbyterian* Priſts, Whether then that there is not three Perſons in a Man (dwelling in him) that is a *Perſon*? for the Apoſtle ſaith, *That your Bodies are the Temples of the Holy Ghoſt, and that your Bodies are the Temples of God, and that Chriſt is in you, except ye are Reprobates?*

The **DIVINITY** of **CHRIST**, Confessed by us called *Quakers*; — And, What we own touching the *Deity* or *God-head*, according to the Scriptures.

**T**hat there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and our Lord Jesus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him.

That there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word,

Word, and the Spirit, and that these three are One, both in Divinity, Divine Substance, and Essence; not three Gods, nor separate Beings.

That they are called by several Names in Scripture, as manifest to, and in the Saints, (for whatsoever may be known of God, is manifest in man, Rom. 1.) and their Record received as the full testimony of three, by such as truly know and own the Record of the three in Earth; and yet they are Eternally One in Nature and Being; One infinite Wisdom, One Power, One Love, One Light and Life, &c.

We never denied the Divinity of Christ, as most injuriously we have been accused by some prejudiced spirits, who prejudicially in their perverse Contests have sought occasion against us; As chiefly because (when some of us, were in Dispute with some Presbyterians) we could not own their unscriptural distinctions and terms, — (touching the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit) to wit, Of their being incommunicable, distinct, separate persons, or Subsistences, whereas the Father, the Word, and Spirit are One, not to be compared to corruptible men, nor to finite Creatures or Persons, which are limitable and separable.

For, the only Wise God, the Creator of all, who is One, and his Name One, is infinite and inseparable, Deut. 6. 4. Zec. 14. 9. And the Father's being the Son, and the Spirit's being sent, we witness to and own, as He said, Thou art my Son, this day I have begotten thee, Psal. 2. 7. Heb. 1. 5. And he hath sent his Spirit into our hearts, Gal. 4. 6. And that the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father, yea, in the bosom of the Father, Joh. 1. 18. & chap. 17. 21, 22. so that they are neither divided, nor separate, being One, and of One infinite Nature, and Substance; Christ being the Image of the invisible God; the first born of every Creature, by whom all things were Created, both in Heaven and in Earth, Col. 1. — Yea, the Son of God is the brightness of his glory, and the express Image of his substance, Heb. 1. 3. And that it was in due time God was manifest in Flesh, 1 Tim. 3. 16. As in the fulness of time God sent his Son, Gal. 4. And the Son of God was made manifest to destroy sin, 1 Joh. 3. 8. And a manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal, 1 Cor. 12. — So the manifestation of the Father, of the Son, and Holy Spirit (we confess to, and own to be in Unity (and so the only true God) according to the Scriptures.

And that Jesus Christ being in the Form of God, thought it no robbery to be Equal with God, and yet as a Son, in the fulness of time, was sent

20  
sent of the Father, and took on him the form of a servant, Phil. 2. 6. in which state he said, My Father is greater than I, 1 Joh. 14. 28. And he learned Obedience through Suffering, and was made perfect, and is become an everlasting High Priest, after the Order of Melchisedeck, and is the Author of Eternal Salvation, unto all them that Obey him, Heb. 5. — And God hath given us Eternal Life in his Son: And unto us a Child is born, and a Son is given to Govern, whose Name is Wonderful Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace, Isa. 9. 6. And he is over all, God blessed for ever, Rom. 9. 5. Even the true God, and Eternal Life, 1 Joh. 5.

So that the Deity or Divinity of Christ, in his Eternal, Infinite, Glorious State, we really confess and own; having known his Virtue and Power to redeem us from our vain Conversations, and to save us from wrath to come.

And our knowledge of the only true God, and our Faith in, and concerning him, and his Name, unto our Salvation, doth not consist in the traditional Names, humane Inventions (nor in Philosophical terms, and nice School distinctions, derived from Heathenish Metaphysics; which since the Apostles time, men have put upon the God-head) but in the living sense, and feeling of his Divine Power, Life, and Love, revealed in us by the Spirit of the Son of God; whereby we have (in his gift of Divine Light and Spirit) received Life and Salvation, from sin and death; see Matth. 11. 27. Luk. 10. 22. Matth. 16. 17. Rom. 1. 17. ch. 8. 18. Gal. 1. 16. Eph. 3. 5. 1 Pet. 15. 12. ch. 4. 14. ch. 4. 13. ch. 5. 1. 2 Pet. 1. 3. Matth. 1. 21.

Also we judge, That such Expressions, and Words as the Holy Ghost taught the true Apostles, and Holy Men mentioned in the Scriptures, are most meet to speak of God, and Christ; and not the words of mans wisdom, or humane inventions, and devised distinctions since the Apostles dayes.

Finally, We have received an Election, or Anointing, from the Holy One, which as it doth teach us, we know a continuance in the Father and in the Son, 1 Joh. 2. And for whom we know the Father is well pleased, and in him we know the true Satisfaction, Justification, and Peace, which all that abide in him, enjoy and witness.

Now unto the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the One Eternal Word, The Only Wise, Pure, Perfect God, who is Infinite, Omnipotent, Incomprehensible, who giveth unto all Life and Being, and is  
c the

the Life of all, and the Being of Beings, who filleth all in all with his Presence, those whom he Glory now and evermore, [saith our Souls.]

G. Whitehead.

And for Definition of a Person, or what a Person is, we shall not need to go to Popish and Heathenish Authors, as Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle, and others; as some of these Presbyterian Teachers, and others, have done, when they have gone about to demonstrate their Doctrine of a Trinity of distinct Persons in God; And yet in Contradiction, for a cloak, they pretend the Scriptures to be their Rule, wherein there is no proof of their calling the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, three distinct Persons, while the Scriptures be full and plain enough to prove, define, or shew what a Person is; as namely, a Man or Woman; sometimes the body, the face, or visible appearance of either, &c. But the Infinite God is not like unto corruptible man. See first in the Old Testament (so called) as to Person;

Esau took his Wives, his Sons and Daughters, and all the Persons of his house, Gen. 36. 16. Joseph was a goodly person, Gen. 39. 6. The Number of your persons, Exod. 16. 16. No uncircumcised person, Exod. 12. 48. The person of the poor and of the mighty, Levit. 19. The guilty person, unclean person, Numb. 5. 6. A clean person, Numb. 19. 18. Thirty two thousand persons in all, of Women, &c. Numb. 31. 35. Whosoever killeth any person, ver. 19. Numb. 35. 11, 15, 39. Joth. 20. 39. Abimelech, the son of Jerubbaal, hired vain light persons, and slew his brethren the sons of Jerubbaal, being threescore and ten persons, Judg. 9. [Note here that persons dyed, or were slain. But can it be said of the Immortal God, whom they distinguish into three several Persons, that he ever dyes? And though Christ, as concerning the Flesh, or Person, was put to Death, so was not his Divine Life or Godhead.] And again, Not a goodlier person than Saul, 1 Sam. 9. 23. David a comely person, 1 Sam. 16. 18. When wicked men have slain a righteous person, 2 Sam. 4. 11. They shall come at no dead person, Ezek. 44. 25. Or will he accept thy person, Mal. 1. 8. (These places before cited, with many more, are according to the English.) God accepteth not the person of Princes, Job 34. 19. which in the Hebrew is פְּנֵי שָׂרִים Phené Sarim, i.e. facies Principum, the faces of Princes.

And



2

And the same word פֶּנֶה Phene, is (in Gen. 1.2.) for the face of the deep. See likewise, Gen. 4. 14. Job 38. 30. with many more places in the Old Testament; so that the same word which is translated person, having also relation to the outward face of men and things; how can it be either proper, seasonable, or good Doctrine to Preach the Invisible, Incomprehensible God, under these terms of three distinct or separate Persons? And whether it doth not render God; or represent the Deity, to be like visible men, or finite creatures, that are comprehended in time, yea or nay? And hath not this kind of representing the God-head, produce those vain Conceptions and Imaginations in the minds of the Ignorant, from whence they have formed the Images and Pictures of God, and Christ, and Holy Ghost, made by men of corrupt minds in the night of Apostacy, and Popery, to the great reproach and abuse of the Name of God, and Profession of Christianity in the World?

See also more Scriptures touching Persons, to the same purpose, as before: Judg. 20. 39. 1 Sam. 9. 22. & 22. 18. 22. 2 King. 10. 6. 7. 2 Chron. 19. 7. Plal. 26. 4. Psal. 82. 2. Prov. 12. 11. Prov. 24. 23. Jer. 52. 29. 30. Lam. 4. 16. Ezek. 17. 17. Chron. 27. 13. Joh. 4. 11. Zeph. 3. 4. Mal. 1. 9.

And 2dly in the New Testament (so called) it appears, that the word Person or Persons is mentioned with the same acceptation, as before in the Old: As for instance, Thou regardest not the person of man Matth. 22. 16. Mar. 12. 14. Luk. 20. 21. In the Greek it is προσωπον, i.e. faciem hominum, the face of men; In the Hebrew it is פֶּנֶה הָאָדָם phene haadam. Doth not this still relate to the outward or visible appearance of man? See also, Matth. 27. 24. 1 Cor. 5. 13. Gal. 2. 6. Eph. 5. 5. Heb. 12. 16. 2 Pet. 2. 5. Luk. 15. 7. Act. 10. 34. & 17. 17. Rom. 2. 11. Jude 16. 2 Cor. 1. 11. Eph. 6. 9. Col. 3. 25. 1 Tim. 1. 10. Jam. 2. 1. 9. 1 Pet. 1. 17. 2 Pet. 3. 11. In all which it is evident, That the word persons is attributed to men, &c.

And as to that of 2 Cor. 2. 10. where some of our English Copies have it, To whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it, in the Person of Christ; The words in the Greek ἐν προσώπῳ χριστοῦ are translated in facie Christi, in the face of Christ; And some of the Latins have it, in conspectu Christi, in the sight of Christ. And that in Heb. 1. 13. where speaking of the Son of God, In some of the English we have it thus, — Who being the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image

23  
of his Person: In the Greek it is  $\chiαρακτὴρ$  τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, *his Character substantia eius*, and the Character of his Substance: It is not τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, of his Person. As also in Heb. 11. 1. Faith is the substance of things hoped for. The same word ὑπόστασις, is used for Substance, as before in Heb. 1. 3. and not Person. It would not be proper to say, Faith is the Person of things hoped for, but the Substance. Also the same word is in 2 Cor. 9. 4. (where we have it Constant, or Confident) In Greek ὑπόστασις, in Latine Substantia; Substance, not Person. And so the Son of God is the express Image or Character of his Substance; which cannot be severed (as a distinct Person) from his Substance; he being also the brightness of the glory of God; which expresseth or sheweth the transcendent Glory of his Divine Substance; beyond all visible Appearances, Faces, or Persons; and is only seen and revealed in the Light and Life of God, and his Son within, revealed only to such in whom the Image of God is renewed, whose minds and eyes are so spiritual, as to look and see beyond all the fallen Inventions and Imaginations of corrupt ignorant men, who are groaping in the dark, and vainly imagining to know, comprehend, and declare the Immortal, Invisible God, in such invented Names and Terms, as they have but merely by Tradition from men without, which do most suite their dark thoughts, and carnal conceptions, whereby they can never know God, nor perceive Divine or Spiritual things; but thereby have greatly darkned both themselves, and others.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. I.

*Of the Answer, wherein Thomas Vincent's railing, and sinful Doctrines for Sin and Imperfection, are Refuted, and his Contradictions discovered.*

**I**N *Th. Vincent* his Title Page, and Introduction, a storm of bitter railing, aspersing, and slandering the Innocent People of God called *Quakers*, hath proceeded from him, as *Black-mouths, most hideous Blasphemers, Seditious and damnable Heretical opinions Doctrines, and the like*; with several false accusations and slanders cast upon *G.F. I.N.* and others, which hath been long since Answered and Refuted, both in verbal Testimonies and in Print; And the envious ridged Spirit of several *Presbyterians* against us therein plainly discovered. And let the impartial Reader judge, Whether such like railing Language against us, as *T.V.* hath vented, doth become one pretending to be Christ's Minister, or one that would have People believe he hath built upon the Rock, or hath Christ Jesus for his Foundation; whereas they that learn of Christ, learn meekness, lowliness, humility, and not railing, reviling, and slandering, which proceeds from bitter envy in the heart, which where it is, there is confusion, &c. as plainly appears in *T. Vincent* and his Brethren's Work, which proceeds not from the Wisdom which is from above, which is pure and peaceable, but from that which is earthly, sensual, & devillish. So let the unbiassed judge, whether *T.V.* be a competent man to write about such high Mysteries, about God and Christ, which are concern'd in our Controversie, yea or nay, when he hath shewed himself to be in a contrary Spirit to that of Christ and his Ministers?

And whereas *T.V.* scornfully reflects upon the People called *Quakers*, touching *W.P.* saying, *He being counted among them one of their chief, (this is false) because of some smattering of Learning* which

which they conceive be Bath. This is also both false and scornful, for we lay not such a stress upon *swallowing of Learning*, nor on natural Learning it self, as to make that the supereminent virtue to make men chief amongst us; our esteem does depend upon that which is of a higher nature than either mens Natural parts, Arts, or Learning, even upon the Spirit and Power of God, which gives the right understanding, and is not limited or tyed to mens Traditional Learning and Knowledge, but gives Understanding and Wisdom unto the simple; to see beyond all their corrupt Knowledge and beggarly scraps of Learning and Inventions of men, wherein they are puffed up. But so far as W.P. hath a discovery both of the envious Spirit, and *Babylonish Confusion*, and dark unscriptural Doctrines of T.V. and others of his sledged fraternity; I am confident he doth not impute that discovery to his Natural Learning nor Parts, but to the gift of God's Power and Spirit, and desires to magnifie that over all the other.

And as for T.V. his going to shelter himself with a pretence of those Doctrines which Protestants generally believe to be essential; this will neither cover his weakness and confusion, nor hide the envy of his heart, that hath vented it self in his Pamphlets against an innocent People; Neither do I believe, That any of the unbiassed Protestants (that are accounted competent in these matters) will either own many of T.V. his Principles, or his silly way of managing those that are closed amongst themselves; And as to his accusing us of *unrightfully living in the Fellowship of a false Religion* as the Papists themselves; It may be justly objected upon himself, as in divers things hereafter will appear; and To His hath more absurdly than the Papists, argued for *Three distinct separate Persons, Substances or Substances, or rather Substances, as in the same one single divine Essence*; but more of this hereafter.

One of T.V. his main Accusations against our Doctrine is, That two Quakers asserted the Possibility of Salvation in this Life; and that the proof was 1 Joh. 3.9. *Whoever is born of God doth not commit sin*; To which T.V. answered, That the words *doth not* signify, He doth not make it his business to sin [ whereas it is onely, He doth not do; or commit sin; ] But he should have read a little further; *Whoever is born of God doth not sin*. And the meaning, saith he, was, that such as are born again do not make a trade of sin,

did not go on in a course of sin; did not commit sin with the full bent of the will in the wicked day; but that he could not be understood of committing sin at all, from ch. 1. 8. If we say we have no sin, God shall be speaker of himself, and others; that were born again, &c.

Reply. Let every impartial Reader judge; whether T. K. his meaning, contrary to the plain words of the Apostle, Joh. 3. 9. Be any sufficient proof to evince that our Doctrine of the Perfection of Saints in this Life, is either damnable or heretical.

1. For, first, whosoever John saith, whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. Now T. K. his Doctrine and meaning speaks as much, as that he that is born of God doth commit sin, (shall we believe John or him?) But not so as to make us pale of sin, and to be in a course of sin, with the full bent of his will in the wicked day. How hath he herein accused the Child of God, whom John saith cannot sin, because he is born of God; his being born of God (and so being related to God in his Spirit, Nature, and Image) is made the reason that he commits not sin; but if a man should say, He commits sin, but not because he is born of God; for he is not born of God, with the full bent of his will in the wicked day, because he is born of God; Doth not this rest upon this plain Reason he hath with the Father; and so upon the Nature of God for begetting and bringing forth such an impure birth? And is not this to frustrate the end of the Son of God, in being made manifest to destroy the works of the Devil? whosoever, brother whosoever in Christ flourish on; see further, 1 Joh. 3. 5, 8, 9, 10 verses.

2. Whereas T. K. his contrary meaning is plain Scripture, accuseth the Apostle John, and others that were born again, with committing sin, from that chapter. viij. 8. that doth not prove it against John; but such as he hath to accuse (whereby he hath accused John to be of the Devil, for he that commits sin is so, 1 Joh. 3. 8.) no more then James his laying, With the same Temptation the world, and our self are born, doth prove himself to be one that is cursed, which he said ought not to be; for John writes to divers States and degrees of growth, as to them that had sin to be cleansed from, that they might walk in the light, to know the Blood of Christ to cleanse them from all sin, ver. 7. As also he said, If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse

cleanse us from all unrighteousness, *vers. 9.* Surely *Job* was come further then a Confession of sin at that time; besides, *having sin*, may relate either to a former state, or to its besetting the Creature in the temptations when it is warred against, and in the Faith withstood in its motions, in order to a Conquest, when the Creature doth not commit sin, but withstands it, as *Paul* said, *It is not I that sinne*; so that *having sin*, and committing sin, are two things; for it doth not appear that the beloved Disciple or Apostle *John* was a committer of sin in that state when he wrote that Epistle; for he saith, *vers. 10.* *If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us*; which relates to a state that was past: If we say *we have not sinned*, is not all one as to say, *if we say we do not commit sin*, &c. Yet he saith, *chap. 2. 1.* *My little Children, these things I write unto you, that ye sin not*: Now had *John* been of *T. V.*'s persuasion, that such a state of Perfection, or not Sinning, is not here attainable, why should he exhort them not to sin, and so plainly shew the difference between him that is born of God, and him that is of the Devil? See *Job. 3.* throughout.

And then as to *T. V.* his supposed Consequence from out Doctrine of Perfection, *That whoever found any sin in them, were not born of God*: which, I say, that its neither our Assertion, nor the Consequence of our saying, *That he that's born of God doth not commit sin, for having sin, when it is withstood and warred against by that which is born of God, and committing sin, are two things*; yet we know that *that which is born of God overcomes the World*; and this is the Victory, even our Faith, and the end of Christ's manifestation is to destroy sin, that it may not have a being, so long as we live, in us.

And *T. V.* further adds, *That if they should die with any sin remaining, they would certainly go to Hell, and so none there, yea, none in the World would be saved* he saith: Hereby he still takes it for granted, That there's no such Perfection here as a freedom from all sin, but that all God's Children die with sin remaining in them; I then ask, How long after death shall sin remain, and when and where is the time and place of being fully cleansed after death, is it in the Grave, or is it in some Purgatory? For if God's Children must be cleansed after death, they must be cleansed somewhere, and then in the mean time, betwix death and this supposed time and place



of cleansing and purging, where lies the sin, and pollution, and the stain of it, is it in the Soul, or in the Body? Surely not in the Body when dead, neither can the Soul go to God with sin or pollution in it, for no unclean thing can enter into his Kingdom, or dwell with him; so then the Question still remains, where the Soul is after death, and where is the place of its purging and fully cleansing? If T. K. and his Brethren are not Papists, let them answer, and clear themselves and Principle, from the Popes Purgatory.

T. K. his reviling and calling us, *Audacious Quakers, who have not the least degree of true Grace, because of damnable Opinions.* This his harsh language, and railing, signifies little to us for any proof against us, or what we hold, but only shewes his own peevishness and implacable enmity, as one vexed and fretted in his mind, and so not fit to intermeddle with things of so high concernment, as he hath presumptuously attempted to stir in, as about *Perfection, and the Duty, and Satisfaction of Christ, &c. Justification, Righteousness, &c.* nor yet to call and exhort others, whilst he himself had need to be called and exhorted to repent of his hard and uncharitable speeches and censures, and to come to meekness and moderation, which would better become his Profession; And his confidence, that we have not the least degree of true grace, is both a false and uncharitable confidence, and charge against us; as also his flaunting and jeering *H. P.* as having but *some smattering of Learning*, and being but *little of a Schooling*, never so much as we understand *Logick*, or to have forgot, or laid it aside. Herein hath he manifested himself both scornful and ridiculous, to make so much use of his own pretended Learning, Arguments, *Logick*, Demonstration, &c. to such as he reckons hath neither *true grace*, nor *Learning*; it appears T. K. had a mind to shew himself in a vain flourish and boasting over such whom he hath endeavoured to render contemptible, mean, and ignorant, as he hath done us; all which doth but the more manifest the pride of his heart, vain-glorious &c.

And then he adds, *I told them that all true Believers were perfect in a sense, they were Evangelically perfect, but not legally, not absolutely perfect; they had perfection of parts, but not of degrees.*

I Answer, What confusion is here, and what contradiction to his former Doctrine of Imperfection and Sin in this Life; for first

an *Evangelical Perfection* he grants, but not a *Legal*; as if either the Law, or the state under it, were above the Gospel; or else that the state of the Gospel is not a state of Perfection exceeding that under the Law, but *inferior*: both which are false and absurd. For this Doctrine doth not only charge Imperfection upon the Creature under the Gospel; but upon the Gospel it self, whilst *Evangelical Perfection* is deemed either Imperfection, or not a Freedom from sin or transgression of the Law, whilst here and then judge whether Imperfection and Sin be *Evangelical*. Surely all, who have any true spiritual knowledge of the Law, Gospel, and new Birth, may easily see beyond this man, and also see his Ignorance and Contradiction to himself: for the state of the Gospel is so far from being inferior to that under the Law that it exceeds; for God sending *Christ* with his people under the first Covenant, law it needful to establish a *Law*, in which forgiveness of sin, destroying sin, and the Devil being taking it away, and making an end of it, and remembering sin no more; (and so Perfection) are to be known by the enjoyers and subjects of this Covenant; as also the Gospel is not more of the Law, nor the righteousness of it, for *Christ* is the end of the Law, *Christ* is the end of the Law; and the Righteousness of *Christ* is not from pointing in to the Righteousness of the Law, that true believers do not make void the Law through Faith, but establish it; and the Law of the Spirit of Life in *Christ* makes free from the Law of Sin and Death. So that the Righteousness and Concordance brought forth in the true and living Faith, which shines in the Power of God, doth answer the righteous Law of God in the heart, and exceeds and surpasses all self-righteousness, and all their outward imitations of the Law in the letter of it; but this none knows but those who comes to own the Light and Spirit of Faith inward, and the Law of it. It is not known to such as these men, who count the *Light within an Idol*, and reckon that it *divides contrary to the Light of the Word and Spirit*, as in their pages 15. & 53.

But as to his *Perfection of parts*, but not of degrees, this is strange Doctrine; for if it be a *Perfection of parts*, but not of degrees, what parts are they, and wherein consist their Perfection not of degrees? but if he had said there is a Perfection of kind but not in the full height or highest degree of it, then he had said something, though

thoughts his own contradiction. But where he adds, *That in this sense, the work of Grace, though the work of God, was not perfect in regard of our selves but by degrees, may carry on unto further Perfection.* Now in contradiction to himself, he hath confess the Work of God by degrees carried on unto further Perfection, which if so, here is both Perfection in its degrees, which vary not the property or kind, as also the work of Grace, in its carrying on unto further Perfection: so then there is a time of perfecting, or working the work of Grace in order to Perfection, and a time wherein it comes to be wrought and perfected. And now the kind and nature of that Perfection which we believe and plead for, is that which God requires, and Christ worketh, who doth the Father's Will therein in all that truly believe, the which consists in Righteousness and true Holiness, not in any imagined, conceived, or self-righteousness brought forth in man's will; which is not real nor perfected either in man's will, worshipping, self-performing, or applications, which are neither from living Motions of true Faith, nor Evidence of the Spirit of God within, but from man's self-will imaginations and traditions, in one mind aiming at another, and modeled after the

And whereas *T. K.* tells of some that were established in the wayes of Truth, intending in his Ministers. Hitherto again he hath contradicted himself, for *Establishment in the wayes of Truth*, is a high state of Perfection; and such admit not of his Preaching up sin, nor of moving from any of Truth's wayes, which his Doctrine for sin and Imperfection, term of Life doth not at all tend too, but rather to keep People in thralldom, and captivity, and in a wavering tossed estate in the wayes of sin, which are all contrary to the wayes of Truth; for the wayes of Truth do not admit of a continuance in the wayes of Error, either in Principle, or Practice.

And whereas *T. K.* complains so sadly *That some of his Friends, Mother and Daughters, that went off to the Quakers, in his former absence.* It appears that they were not *Established* by him; as also that he hath led his Hearers to depend more upon himself, than upon the Teachings of God, or his Light within, which is the cause of many's wavering and uncertainty who have followed him, so that if their Teacher or Shepherd *T. K.* should move into a corner, or if upon Persecution he should flee, he doth himself for fear, as

many

many of them have done, then his flock (or at least many of them) would be liable to be scattered: but who comes to wait upon God in his Light and Spirit, to know him their Shepherd and Leader, their Teacher will not be removed into a corner, nor their Shepherd flee from them.

And whereas T. V. further adds, in an angry reviling manner, against the Mother and Daughter, *That the Mother should so much indulge a perverse Will in her; and being a Parent, that it's like to prove the destruction of Mother and Child, &c.* His thus openly reviling of them in *Print*, may tend to set them further against him then ever; and now they may see more of his Spirit than before, and if they abide in the Light, to which their minds have been directed, and by which their understandings have been opened since they came amongst us, they will further feel, and see cause for ever to bless the Lord for bringing them out from amongst such false Teachers and Ministers of Sin and Imperfection, as T. V. and his Brethren have manifested themselves to be: as also seeing what follows from his corrupt Heart and unclean Spirit, it may set all sober minds, and modest Persons against him and his Doctrine more than ever, as they take a view thereof, which most sordid reviling of his was the chief cause and occasion of these Controversies between us.

T. V. *I acknowledge I did say it was worse to go to the Quakers Meetings than to a Bawdy-house, because the defilement of the Soul with these damnable Errors, was more deep and more hard to be washed off, than the defilement of Whoredom or Adultery.*

*Ans.* To which, I say, let all sober-minded Readers but mark the wickedness and grossness of this man's Doctrine, thus to set an esteem of *Bawdy-houses* above our Meetings? What but Impudence and Wickedness could have vented such Doctrine publicly? It is no marvel that he can so plead and contend for Sin and Imperfection, whilst he seems it worse to go to our Meetings (where Sin, Wickedness, and Uncleaness is openly Preached against) than to go to a *Bawdy-house* where it's committed; What abominable Doctrine is this! and Infamy, and a ground of suspicion against himself hath he given hereby, and how contrary to the Spirit and Doctrine of the true Ministers this of his is, for they were so far from such Doctrine, that they reckoned such things

things not meet to be named amongst them, as becometh Saints, Eph. 5. And how corrupt and grosse is *T. V.*'s reason for his wicked and unflavoury Doctrine before, in saying, *Because the defilement of the Soul is more deep and more hard to be washed off, than the defilement of Whoredom or Adultery*: As if they did not defile the Soul, but the Body only; this is a Doctrine that may gratifie Whoremongers and Adulterers, and not only to reject the whollom Warnings and Reproofs against all such Wickedness, which both in their own Consciences, and in our Meetings, is declared and Preached against; but also, it tends rather to encourage them to go to *Bandy-houses*, than to our Innocent and Godly Meetings, wherein the Truth, Righteousness, and Power of God, which cleanseeth and frees from sin and unrighteousness, is exalted, and born witness to.

*T. V.* having so manifestly discovered his Spirit, he had now better go and sit down under the Common Prayer, and confess himself a miserable Sinner among the rest, and not remain in a separation with his wheedling and whining Prayers, feigning himself as one more Holy and Humble than they: What sober People could have thought that such foulness should lie under these *Presbyterian* coverings, as is mentioned before, and after!

And *T. V.* further adds, to explain his gross corrupt Doctrine, these words, *viz. I told her, if there stood a Cup of Poison in the Wine-dome, I would rather drink it, than drink in these damnable Dissensions; because poisoning of the Body is not so bad as poisoning and damning the Soul.* By which the Reader may further see how his prejudice and envy hath blinded him thus to imply, as if Persons might commit either *Whoredom or Murder* upon their Bodies, and their Souls not be defiled, or damned thereby; and then what actual wickedness may not People commit, and their Souls not be damnified nor prejudiced by it, from this Doctrine; whereas the wicked flayeth his own Soul; altho' up his Soul to vanity; the Peoples lustling after evil things, caused leanness to enter their Souls; tribulation and anguish is to come upon every Soul of man that doth evil: And it is only the Power and Life of God which purifies the Soul, sanctifies the Creature throughout, in Body, Soul, and Spirit, and so leads into Righteousness, and thereby saves and brings the Soul to God, and gives it Life, and indues it with the Image of the Heavenly.

But after this, *T. F.* hath uttered such corrupt Language and Doctrine as before, he is so bold as to justify himself in these words, viz. *I am sure I neither did, nor shak any thing unbecoming a Minister of the Gospel.* That I refer all modest and sober Readers to Judge of, Whether *T. F.* hath spoken Truth herein, yea or nay? and; whether or no it had not been more prudence for him to have studied quietness, and quietly to have followed his Devotion with thankfulness for the Liberty they are permitted to enjoy; than thus to have shewed himself in outrage with clamorous reproaches and reviling against us (who mean him no harm) to the great disgrace both of himself and his Religion, and them that adhere to him therein.

And as for his accusing me with *confused Discourse, and indirect Answers* to his *Arguments*, and with *filling my Mouth and the Peoples Ears with a multitude of words, wherein was so much ambiguity and obscurity, that the sentiments of my mind were not easily to be perceived* as he saith. Wherein I have as much cause to complain of not having direct Answers from him, as he seems to have against me; whilst he was so puzzled and put to it with what I said; though I answered them in plain Scripture-language; And wherein their Questions, or pretended Arguments, were either indirect, or in terms, which accorded not with Scripture-language, I did not judge my self engaged so far, to admit of the stating their matters (as being infallible in the manner and terms of them) as to be eyed to *Yes* or *No* denial of *Moses* or *Miriam*, without further scruple. Their Arguments appear hereafter.

And whereas *T. F.* pleads for using some words in explaining Scripture which are not in the Scripture, saying, *That the Quakers (in their Books) use many words which are not in the Scripture.*

I Answer, We neither commend words or matters which are not contrary, or do not tend to veil or darken the Truths (or simplicity of the innocent language) contained in Scripture; neither do we go about to impose one manner and form of expression upon others, or limit them therein whilst they speak the Truth, or what is in, or according to Scripture; We are not of kin to the narrow Spirit of the ridged *Presbyters*, that will commit a man's *Magisterium Heretic*, *Scismatic*, *Arian*, and what not, if he can't repeat his Creed of the *Duty*, or *Father*, *Word*, and *Spirit*, in their invented



Invented School-terms, although he really believeth and confesseth according to Scripture, unto the only true God, the eternal Word and Spirit; for, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that they are One, and in Unity inseparable.

And whereas T. K. saith, That W. P. puts forth the sting of Abo-  
*Serpent in tearing his Prayers strangely affected Whines, what more*  
*opprobrious terms, saith he, would the Damned Blades of the Times*  
*have used, &c.*

To which I say, That he did not only use a strange affected way of Whining in his feigned Praying, but also therein most falsely accused us for *Blasphemers*, in telling God, That we compared Him, and his Son, and Holy Spirit, to three finite Creatures, which more justly, was charged upon himself and his Brethren, from their distinction of Persons in the Deity. T. K. lye to God was so apparent in this matter, that some that were by, said, The next time he Prayed, he had need to ask God forgiveness for telling him that Lye; for our comparison was to evince the natural consequence of their own distinction, and the gross tendency of it, as further is manifest; and used to represent the infinite God like unto man, or finite Creatures, as they have done about their *Personalities*; And his comparing W. P.'s words to such scurrilous as those use he calls *The Damned Blades of the Times*, he should rather have began at home, and judged himself for his own wicked opprobrious terms, in saying, *We was worse to go to the Quakers Meetings, than to a Bawdy-house*; what more gross terms could the Damners and Sinkers have used, but evil words corrupt good namers.

And as for his Confidence that it is *unlawful* that they did use such words as *impudent* &c. that there was striking among some of T. K.'s Hearers. There are Persons of repute and credit, who can testify both against them, and to my knowledge, in honest sober Women did affirm, That one of his Hearers thumped her on the Back when we were about that Dispute with them; besides the malice, envy, and rudeness that appeared amongst them, in clamouring, railing, and reviling us (like the *Billingsgate* folks) though without any just cause, both then, and when we were afterward at that Meeting to clear our selves from T. K.'s and W. P.'s malicious and slanderous accusation of *Blasphemy*; yea even in the time when I sat silent amongst them, some of their Hearers, both Men

and Women would be railing and clamouring against me, when I gave them no seeming (much less real) occasion at all, I being silent. So that of all the Assemblies I have been in, I never met with any that shewed less Christianity, Civility, or good Education.

And whereas T. V. is neither so honest, nor yet so ingenious, as to acknowledge his apparent and palpable Contradictions in his Sermon; set down and observed by W. P. but rather would put face us and the Readers, as though they were no Contradictions.

The Reader therefore take a short review of them; as T. V. his Contradictions. *First, That a Person that is born of God overcomes the world, and yet the Victory in this Life is incomplete.*

Is not here an evident inconsistency and contradiction in his Doctrine, and ignorance of the Child of God, and the Saints Victory, which was their Faith, 1. *Job. 5. 4.* For if he have alwayes enemies, or sin unsubdued in this Life, how are they overcome, and victory obtained? Or, is there a Victory over Enemies, and they not overcome? What false glosses would he set upon his Contradictions? And his instance of the *Canaanites among the Children of Israel, being like Thorns, doing them mischief.* This was when they did not as God commanded, drive them out before them, which is no proof in this case to him that is born of God, for the wicked one cannot touch him, much less mischief him.

And T. V. his saying, *That such an one in Christ, and cast off the old Adam, and known a change altogether for New, and yet worldly Lusts cannot be extirpated out of God's People in this World.* Do but mark his plain Contradiction again here, and how doth he clear himself by questions. *May not a Man, and yet have Lusts a being, and some power to oppose in God's People, when they have left their rule?* But how then are they in Christ, and have cast off the old man, and known a change altogether new, what must the old worldly Lusts still remain unextirpated, in this life in Christ? Where then is the newness of Life altogether, or the Gate of God in its teaching to deny those things, obeyed? And how then are such as be in Christ new Creatures? Or, how have they that are his, crucified the flesh with the Affections and Lusts? Which to accuse all God's People of worldly Lusts all their life time, what an abuse is it to them? Did not Paul see and attain a state beyond that wherein he had seen a Law in his members warring and leading him captive, &c. Did not he

As the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ, to make him free from the Law of Sin & Death; when through Christ he became more than a conqueror? And could he be in all those states he mentioned to the Romans then, at one and the same time (to wit) carnal, sold under sin, led captive, having a will to do that which was good, but knew not how; and also to be freed from the Law of Sin and Death, by the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus; one dead to sin, that could not live any longer therein, and more than a conqueror, &c. could those states be consistent, or all *his* at one and the same time? viz. To be Carnal, Wretched, a Captive, ignorant of his Duty, and yet a Delivered, Freed, Spiritual man, more than a Conqueror, and an Apostle that then knew how to write that Epistle, Instruct others, and Preach to them in the Fulness of the Gospel? Were not these latter his Attainments at that time; wherein he shews his deliverance from the former Bondage, Servitude, and Thralldom under the power of Sin, and the Law and Body of it, which is not to remain alwayes, but to be ended, abolished, and destroyed, by the Power and Operation of Jesus Christ in them that believe; For if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is Life because of Righteousness. And where the old man is crucified, with him, it is to the destruction of the body of sin; that henceforth sin should not be served, Rom. 6. 6. chap. 8. 10. And Paul speaking to the Romans, after the manner of men, because of the infirmity of their flesh, ch. 6. 19. And his so condescending to speak of several states that he had passed through, was not to encourage any to plead or contend for sin term of life, as most injuriously his Intention is perverted by these Ministers of Sin and Antichrist, whilst that he also shews his Deliverance and Conquest; but rather that men should believe as he had done, in order to their obtaining perfect Victory and Conquest by the same Power and Spirit of Christ; in which true Believers confide and trust, against all the powers of Darkness, Temptations, and evil Moxions, knowing that Christ's Power is stronger than the Devils power. And it's for Christ's Power and Work, that we contend both against the Devil, his Work, and Messengers, who dispute and contend for sin term of life, which is their great injury both against Christ, his Work, and People; and thus which hath greatly strengthened the hands of evil-doers.

And *T.V.* his telling, That *sin* may tyrannise both *Believers*, and yet not have Dominion, but be in Captivity; in *Chains*.

Who is so blind that cannot see his Contradiction herein, and his Silly come off, in instancing that a Slave is *Chained* may sometimes break loose and Tyrannize; what then is this Captivity and these *Chains* under which the sin is held, and how doth it tyrannize, and yet not have dominion, what Silly work is this? But his saying, *You must kill or be killed, either you must overcome the world, or the world you*: What must they kill but sin and worldly lusts? Surely this is further than an incompleat Victory, and further than an Enemy breaking loose if he be killed; for if he be slain, he hath neither power to break loose, lead captive, and much less to tyrannize over *Believers*. It is strange how *T.V.* can so far shut his eyes, or endeavour to blind others, as to seek to gloss over these notorious Contradictions, as if they were in unity; and then lightly to say, *Can you forbear smiling at the man, he calleth these Contradictions*. How shallow and ridiculous hath he rendered himself herein!

#### CHAP. II.

In Answer to *W. Madox*, together with several Contradictions between him, and his Brother *T. Vincens*; and their Absurdities manifested and detected; which shew also their ignorance of the true and Living God, &c.

*W. Madox.* These men having professed themselves to be blind of their own brains. The Light within, which is their Christ & Saviour, cannot be the Doctrine of the true God a strange Doctrine.

Ans. The Light within which we do own, witness to and obey, is the Light of Christ, which witnesseth against all sin, against all Idolatry and unrighteousness, and leads us in the Doctrine of the true God, which we receive in the Light, and not mens Traditions and corrupt Doctrines and Inventions, whereby People have been kept in the dark, by such perverse and prejudiced Spirits, as thus blasphemously despise the Light within, as *Idol* of our own brains; whereas it is the Light and Life of the Eternal Word, which enlightens every man that cometh into the World; that we resist

unto,

unto; against all the dark opposers and pain-ayers, whose wayes are dark and crooked, as thine *M<sup>r</sup>. M<sup>r</sup>.* us, who thus falsely and blasphemously hast represented the Light within (like those that put Light for Darkness, and Darkness for Light.) And now let the Reader judge, Whether such dark evitious Persons (as thou herein hast shewed they self) are fit to be Judges in these things of Controversie, about such high matters, touching the Three that bear Record in Heaven (*viz.* The Father, The Word, and The Spirit) when thou in thy earthly sensual wisdom never camest there, neither canst thou till thou countest it loss unto thee, and com'st to loose it, that the Babe's state that enters the Kingdom be known, in which the Light and Life of the Son of God is manifest, which discovers the hidden things of darkness, and reveals the Mysteries of God's Salvation to them that obey it; but not to such as count it *an Idol*; and now what may we expect but darkness from such an one as calls the Light within *an Idol*; and they that look into thy following work against us, may see the gross darkness thereof, yea, darkness that may be felt.

*W. M<sup>r</sup>. Boucher* *threes Persons, you mean (tho three incarnated Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.)*

*Threes incarnated Persons* are thy own words and terms; but the Father, Word, and Spirit, we really own, and bear witness to, both as mentioned in the Scripture, and as knowing the absolute Testimony and Eternal Power thereof manifested, where that which may be known of God is manifest (even within) both in creating, begetting, and quickning us again to God out of death and darkness. And these Three which are One; which bear Record in Heaven, to wit, The Father, the Word, and the Spirit, as I could not own the title of *Three distinct and separate Persons* to be put upon them, as thy Brother Erroniously did (being not Scripture-language) so it was never my intent, nor Principle, to compare them to three Apostles, or finite Creatures, as most falsely and injuriously thou accusest me. But to endeavour to make the People understand both the grossness and fallenness of *The Danson's* and *The Vicens's* Principles of *three distinct separate Persons* in the Deity, you naming each *Person God*, which renders them *Three Gods* (whilst but *One God*) by shewing the Consequence of this your Principle; After I had from Scripture shewed how inseperable the Father and the Son were, and

and the Quench of the Father, Word, and the Spirit; but if I had simply compared them to three Apostles, who were distinct and separate Persons, then had I owned your own Terms and Principles; and then the Controversie had fallen between us: But instead thereof, I am accused for opposing your Doctrine of *distinct separate Persons*; and thus you confound your selves in wronging of me; for were not the three Apostles, *Paul, Peter, and John*, three distinct separate Persons (did I ever deny that they were) how like them to *finite Creatures* doth your own Doctrine render the Eternal God, his Word, &c Spirit; which to shew, was my end in instancing three Apostles, for we never believed the Eternal God to be like to corruptible man, since we knew any thing of his Divine Power. But *T. Dawson* in his *Synopsis*, pag. 42. plainly instanceth three Apostles, *Peter, James, and John*; as also his instance of *David and Solomon* for their Trinity, or *three Persons in one nature*; Was not this an instance of *finite Creatures*, and such an indignity put upon God as I never intended: How can such men but blaspheme for charging that on others, which so evidently they are guilty of themselves?

*Madox. We call the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Persons, or He's, according as they are held forth in the Scriptures.*

*Answer.* Nay, had you stood to Scripture language, there had not been any Controversie between us therein; but it would not satisfy you, but you must obtrude your Popish unscripture-like terms and distinctions; or rather worse, in telling not only of *Three* but *separate Persons*, which being plainly refuted from Scripture, you may remember I several times called to *T. D.* and *T. P.* to confess their Error, I shewing how inseparable the Father and the Son were, reflecting chiefly on the words *separate Persons*, which, how you come off about, will appear hereafter. And as for their being *Three He's*, thou *W. M.* durst not keep to any Argument from thence, or to make that any Cause, or Reason, why we must own them to be *Three Persons*, though here thou seemst to make the terms equivalent, *viz. Three Persons, or He's*; so then it appears that either will serve, if the Three that bear Record in Heaven be but own'd under the Name of *Three He's*, it will serve instead of *Three distinct Persons*; but then, are all *He's* or *Males*, *Persons*; and all *Females* or *Females*, *no Persons*? What strange Logick is implied here? And where doth the Scripture mention *Three distinct Persons* thou tellst of,



of, are they three distinct increated Persons? If so, then mayst thou not as well say they are three distinct Infinities, three Eternals, and so three Gods. Where is now the blasphemy, and blasphemers? And Christ's speaking of another Comforter, which was the Spirit of Truth, *John* 14. 16. was not another Person distinct from him, for that Spirit was then in him; neither doth he use those words, for the same Comforter, or Spirit, was in him, and was that divine Life that then spoke in him, when he was personally present with them; He doth not say, he would send them another Person to Comfort them, but speaks more spiritually, for though they had been Comforted in his outward Presence and Ministry, yet his spiritual Presence was that other Comforter, for ever to abide with them; for in that *John* 14. 17. Christ speaking of the Spirit of Truth, or that other Comforter, saith, he that dwelleth with you, shall be in you, *vers.* 18. *I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you*; which clearly explains his former words, which to say this Comforter was a Person distinct from Christ, is all one, or as absurd as to say the Spirit or Life that was in him, was a distinct Person from him, or that he was a Person distinct from himself; for, *I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you*; or were it not gross to say, That Christ in his People, is a Person distinct from Christ, or the Eternal Word.

And as to thy telling of another Comforter, *i. e.* *Another as to subsistence, or manner of being*: What manner of being, and wherein can it differ from Christ's spiritual manner of being? Had he another manner of being distinct from his own? Who cannot see the ignorance and confusion of thy blind distinction? For it appears, that thy distinction of *three distinct Persons, subsistences, or manners of being*, is attributed to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before Christ's Bodily or Personal Appearance in the form of a Servant, thou telling us (*they being of an infinite nature, are three persons*). Is this a good Argument for thy turn (whereas *T. V.* saith, *Christ, as man, was not fifty years old*, pag. 31.) whilst thou argues from *John* 14. 16. for their being *three distinct persons, subsistences, or manners of being*; For, were they *three distinct Comforters of an infinite nature*? Or, *three distinct separate persons of an infinite nature*? And was Christ's manner of being in the Flesh of an *infinite nature*? Or was he therein a Fourth Person? Surely when Christ had taken  
D upon

upon him the form of a Servant, and that he said; *My Father is greater than I;* (now *W. M.* confesseth, that the form of God was his divine nature, which is above the form of a Servant) and he being in the likeness of sinful flesh, made a little lower than the Angels in respect of his Sufferings, humbling himself to the Death of the Cross. In this manner, and in these capacities he was not declared to be from Eternity (but as he was equal with God in his Glory, before the World was); neither can *three consubstantial, coequal distinct persons*, be argued from thence; for the Controversie runs higher; as before, they being of an infinite nature, are three increased persons; he should rather have said, are one divine substance, or being, which is of an infinite nature. But in plain Contradiction these *Presbyterians* tells us, in their 45. pag. That in the abstract, infiniteness is not applicable to the subsistence; what then is become of their three infinite increased persons, or subsistences? Are they now chang'd from infinite to finite? What sad work is this! Where are the Blasphemers now? Are they not herein found guilty of that, which most unjustly they have charg'd on us, *viz.* Of that which is plainly derogatory to the Glory of the Infinite God, by going to fasten the limitations of finite Creatures upon him? For, if there be a subsistence, or personality, or manner of being (as he defines subsistence) in the God-head, which is not infinite; then something finite is in God which is no less than blasphemy to affirm. And if there be three such distinct subsistences in the relative Property of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as *W. M.* saith, pag. 19. to which infiniteness is not applicable: Then have they denied the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be Infinite; and by this the Reader may see what their unscriptural distinctions of Persons and Subsistences in the Deity amount to, and how most derogatory to the Glory of the Infinite God they are. But the remarkableness of their gross Contradictions is so obvious, that he that runs may read it; for one while the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being of an infinite nature, are three distinct persons three increased persons; which renders them three distinct Infinite and so Three Gods. Another while infiniteness is not applicable to them as such, or as subsistences, which renders them under the limitations of finite Creatures. Do you think that the wiser sort, either among Papists, or Protestants, or Church of England, own the

those men's management of this matter; or will their Work stand them in any stead, or be to the advancement of the Christian Faith in other Nations? If these men should go into Turkey, and also among the Indians, and pretend to Preach the everlasting God, or the Father, the Word, and Spirit, under such Names, Terms, and Distinctions, as being *three distinct and separate persons, or subsistences, to which infiniteness is not applicable*; what would be the effect and consequence of such Preachings do you think? Would it not bring a reproach upon the Name and Profession of Christianity, and render the Christians as believing and expecting Salvation from finite Persons, or Creatures? Or else, if they should Preach them to be three distinct or separate Persons, as being of an infinite nature, might not they reasonably conclude that they were Preaching three Gods? Would not this kind of Preaching more stumble the Jews and Turks from believing in Christ, than ever; and the more strengthen the Heathen in their Idolatrous Imaginations (especially whilst they oppose the Light within as an Idol) for whilst a Doctrine is Preached implying three Gods, may they not suppose many more? As also, how have many ignorant People, in the time of Darkness, been begotten into vain Imaginations touching the Godhead, by such Doctrine aforesaid (contrary to Scripture-language) as to think God to be like unto a Man, or Person; whereas he is a Spirit, he is Invisible, even that Eternal Word, or Spirit, which made all things, and Christ is the Image of the Invisible God, not divided nor separate from him. \* *The Unity of the whole Image he is* \*. And though in the World there are Gods many, and Lords many, yet to us there is but One God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and One Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him, 1 Cor. 8. 6. So that it was never any Design, or Plot of ours, to endeavour to, prejudice the minds of any against the Deity of Christ, had the Holy Ghost, as falsely and blasphemously we are accused by this our prejudiced Opposer.

W. M. *What you mean by separate, I know not; if you mean so separate as to destroy the unity and simplicity of the divine Essence, I own no such separation; if you take it to be all one with distinct, then it is no begging the Question.* And in their 39. pag. it is said, viz. *The*

word *Separate Person* I disown any further then we may conceive it to signify no more then distinct.

*Ans.* It appears then, that *T. D.* and their using the word *separate persons*, was to explain their meaning of *distinct persons*; for it was used after *distinct*, viz. *distinct and separate persons*; which word *separate persons*, they know I chiefly reflected upon at the Dispute. I proving the contrary from Scripture, viz. both the Oneness and Inseparability of the Father, Word, and Spirit; but seeing they own no such separation as to destroy the Unity of the Divine Essence, why did they make use of the word *Separate* at all in the case, telling us, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are *three distinct and separate persons*, which they confess are of *one divine Essence*. Now they disown *separate* any otherwise then it signifies *distinct*; but they should not have own'd it at all in this case. Is it not sad Doctrine that supposeth any Separation, Finiteness, or Limitation, in this Divine Being? But if the Separation relate to the *Personality*, or their *distinctions of persons*, and not to the *Essence*, then doth not this tend to divide God, or to separate Father, Son, and Spirit, who are in each other, and how then are they *three distinct, coeternal, consubstantial, coequal Persons*? Or how are they *three distinct incarnated persons of an infinite nature*, as before? but another while not *infinite in the Personality*; what wonderful confusion and gross contradictions are here! and what strange boldness is it for men, so dark in their understandings, discomposed in their minds, confused and incongruent in their Principles, thus ignorantly to attempt to define or demonstrate the infinite Power, or God-head, which is out of their sight, and beyond their earthly capacities, who are so ignorant of God who is Light; they count the Light within an *Idol of our own brains*, as *W. M.* hath blasphemously done; whereas it is the Light by which God hath shined in our hearts, to give us the knowledge of his Glory, in the face of Christ, 2 Cor. 4.

*W. M.* Read also Job 34. 10. *God thy Maker.* Heb. consult Mr. Cantil on the place. Eccles. 12. 1. *Remember thy Creator, &c.* Isa. 54. 5. *Thy Maker is thy Husband*; in all which Texts, the *Trinity of Persons* is denoted by words of the plural number.

*Ans.* Upon which Inquiry, is the distinction of *three Persons* derived from *three Makers*, or *three Creators*? Or dare they say, That the Father, Word, and Spirit, are *three distinct, scurced, or separate*.

*separate Creators*, and doth not this bespeak three Gods? And what sense is it to say, *thy Makers* [is] *thy Husband*? from *Isa. 54: 5*: where it is said, *Thy Maker is thine Husband, the Lord of Hosts is his Name*; Is not this truly rendered? See *Pagnini's* Versions, *Gen. 1: 26*. *factorem tuum*. It's neither *sunt* (nor *est*) *factores tui*: And *Eccles. 12: 1*. it's *unus Borecha Creatoris tui*, in singular; it's not *Creatorum tuorum*. And *Job 35: 10*. it's *Osai, factor meus*; not *factores mei*. But whilst one God and one Lord is confessed, how is it consistent that a plurality of several Persons be in him as *Makers, Creators, &c.* What ground have we to believe either *Carryl* or *Madox* herein, more than *Pagn.* and our English Translation, with many others.

And notwithstanding this great stir they have made with their distinctions of *separate persons, incommunicable properties, &c.* yet *W. M.* hath confessed, *That the Names, Properties, or Attributes, Works and Worship of God, are frequently in Scripture given to each of these Three Persons, so that they are one and the same perfect and infinite Essence, one God by Nature, &c.* (but if he should distinguish *personal Attributes* from *Attributes of God*, I ask what they are if not of God) which if so, how is *infinity* not applicable to them, now ascribed to them? And how have you gone with your vain unscriptural distinctions to darken Counsel, to darken Scripture, to darken the minds of People by words without knowledge, thereby going to demonstrate that to others, which you cannot clear to yourself by demonstration; As *T. V.* in his 26 pag. faith of the Trinity, touching which he would have us Assent unto your terms and traditional distinctions upon *Divine Authority*, which he cannot demonstrate by reason. But how then shall we receive your bare Assertions upon Divine Authority, when we have neither Scripture, nor Reason, nor yet any immediate Revelation from you for them; must we pinn our Faith upon your sayes? or will you supply the places of so many Popes, by Imposing an implicit Faith in those matters which you cannot demonstrate, nor clear to your selves: which then, how can you clear them to others? Which if this be the course you take to convince gain-sayers of your Doctrine, you might have spared a great deal of labour in going about so confusedly to demonstrate your case to us, and only have laid down your Doctrine of *three distinct separate Persons* in the Deity, to which *infinity* is

not.

not ascribed as you have said in page 143. And so you might as well have said, That we T. W. M. and T. D. do affirm it, and therefore you must believe it; or otherwise you are blasphemous Hereticks, and so damned. But we must have better ground for our Faith, and a better Authority than Affirmations, Revilings, and Threatnings of men, that are untaught themselves in those things which they presume to teach others.

W. M. *I called them three Hee's, to try\* if you*  
 \* *A poor Tryal. would own the Deity of Christ, and the Holy Ghost,*  
*under any title.* As the subject of this Tryal is very mean and weak (to wit) the calling them *three Hee's* to prove the Deity; so his trying of us hereby, was altogether groundless, since that we never disowned the Deity of Christ, or Holy Ghost, as falsely and injuriously is insinuated against us. And since that *three Hee's* will now serve instead of *Persons*, (he saying they are *three Persons, or three Hee's*) to prove the Deity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: Why have they made such a pudder for their distinctions of Persons? But would it be a strong Reason to induce Infidels to the belief of the Deity of each, because they are *three Hee's* as he saith; for, are all *Hee's* either God, (or yet *Person*) or *Divine*? But I need say little to the shallowness of this Work; Let the ingenious Reader judge of it. But when he thinks he mends the matter, by calling them *three divine Hee's*, his intent is, that the Father is called Hee, the Son is Hee, the Spirit Hee; which neither proves them *three separate, nor incommunicable Persons, distinct substances, or persons*; whilst both the Father's a Spirit, the Lord is that Spirit, Christ a quickening Spirit; all inseparable.

W. M. *You by refusing to call them Three Divine Hee's, have made it manifest, that your Quarrel is not with the word Person, as some have apprehended; but with the Doctrine or Fundamental Truth, expressed by the three Persons, viz. the Mutual Distinction, and Essential Union, or Oneness, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*

*Ans.* It is manifest, that some of the Hearers that were present at our Debating this matter, had a better apprehension and understanding of us than you pretended Teachers and Opposers had: for some of them apprehended that we opposed your unscriptural terms and words put upon the Deity, and not that we opposed either the Divinity or Union of Father, Son, or Holy Ghost; neither did we



in the least go to quarrel with any Fundamental Truth, as most grossly and slanderously we are accused and misrepresented by thee *W.M.* who hast shewed thy self (so far from either Truth, Moderation, or Reasonableness in this matter) as one swallowed up with Envie and Prejudice: And thy taking for granted, that thy *Model distinction* and terms, are Fundamental Truth, and joyning them with the Oneness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is but a begging the Question, and presumption in thee, especially whilst by your vain Philosophy some of you have either rendered them as Three Gods, or denied them to be Infinite, as in *pag. 45.* Yea, and it was evident to many, \* That we found fault with your mis-calling and mis-representing the Father, the Word, and Spirit; and never in the least opposed nor questioned their being Three such as mentioned in Scripture, *viz.* The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but there openly confessed to the Fundamental Truth of them in Scripture terms. And when you fell into your needless Questions, and Philosophick terms of *incommunicable properties, subsistence, &c.* I (to bring the matter to be more obvious to the People, to shorten and mitigate the Controversie, and to abate your heat) did tell you, That if you meant by incommunitie of properties, the Fathers begetting the Son, and the Spirits being sent; state your Question so, in plain English, Whether the Son was begotten, and the Spirit sent of the Father, and it would quickly end the Controversie. But nothing would serve you, but an Answer to your vain babling and School-terms, with such a limitation as *Aye or No*; as if the Scripture terms and expressions were in this to be waved and slighted as insufficient, and your confusion, vain philosophy, and deceit, must be set up above the Scriptures of Truth, though you profess them to be your Rule, at other times. But here in plain Contradiction, you have gone about to obscure Divine Mysteries under your Traditional terms of Heathenish Metaphysics, and laid such a stress upon them, as if all were to be deemed *Blasphemies and Heresies*, and so to be damned, that cannot confess, own, and be tyed up to your terms, nice and confused distinctions, which you presumptuously put upon the Father, Word, & Spirit.

\* *The Father, the Word, and the Spirit, truly confessed by us, according to the Scriptures; but these Priests mis-calling them, denied.*

And as for *W. M.* his accusing us with *rejecting the Son, and so the Father*. It is a gross slander, as many more of his accusations are; and never was at in our Intention nor Doctrine so to do, whilst the Oneness of Father, Son, and Spirit, we really confess to, but disown your blind distinctions, which deny them Infiniteness.

And as for *W. M.* his so much talk of *three Hee's, each of which* (he saith) *is by nature God*: We do not read in Scripture, that God is called *three Hee's; or three distinct Hee's*; and therefore three distinct separate Persons (indeed Children in the *Accidents* call *Hee* the third Person singular) But that both the Father and Son speaking of themselves, use the word *Hee*, as I am *Hee*; and he that is with you, shall be in you; Christ speaking of his own manifestation (which was that other Comforter) *I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you*. But each of these *three Hee's* he tells of, he hath told us *is by nature God*; so then they are One, as God, the Word, and Spirit, are.

And as to his charge of Ignorance of Philosophy about *Subsistence*, which he says, *is not a form of a Hee, but the manner of his being*.

His Charge of Ignorance, of his kind of Philosophy, and such nice distinctions (as this between *manner and form*) we can easily bear, and pass by, and leave them to feed upon it, who will choose such chaff for their food, knowing that the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, consists not in such trifles.

*W. M.* The form of God the Father is his Divine Nature, but his Subsistence is his manner of being in the relative Property of the Father; and so he speaks of the Form and Subsistence of the Son and Holy Ghost (as his terms of them are.) Now touching these distinct Subsistences, or manners of being, wherein stands their Model, distinction of Three distinct Personalities,

to our Opposers blasphemous Distinctions, and Contradictions.

to which they say, in *pag. 45*. That infiniteness is not applicable, and that there be three distinct Personalities, unto which infiniteness is not ascribed: Here they have given People to understand what their meaning is about their *three distinct Subsistences, or Personalities*, that they are not Infinite. What then? Is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Finite? What gross darkness is this? Let the impartial Reader judge, whether

whether we have not sufficient ground and cause to oppose them and their vain Philosophy in this so high a matter, and whether herein their Doctrine doth not blasphemously oppose the Divinity of Father, Son, and Spirit; and they go about to eclipse (and detract from) the Glory of the infinite God-head, whilst at other times, in contradiction, they confess each to be God, and tell of the Eternal Son of God, and say, That in the *concret*, every substance is infinite, but not the substance or personality in the *abstract*. What darkness is here? Is God divided, or Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, separate or abstract from their Essences? and where then is this finite personality so much contended for? Is it in God, yea or nay; or relating to his Divine Being, or Substance? But if these distinct personalities or substances, which they say are not infinite, be the relative Properties of the Father, Son, and Spirit, then I ask, Hath not this Doctrine denied both Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to be infinite? Let the unbiassed Readers judge. And yet in Confutation of themselves again, there's *God the Father the first Person, God the Son, a Person distinct from him; God the Holy Ghost, a Person proceeding from both*. How to make sense of these three distinctions, comparing them together, or how to make them hang together without rendering them Three Gods, and not only so, but such as are not Infinite, doth not yet appear to me. And whether my comparison of not understanding *Paul, Peter, and John*, could be three Persons (each of them an Apostle) and yet all but one Apostle, was not suitable to detect these mens unscriptural Doctrines and Distinctions, and to shew the absurdity of the consequences thereof, which whilst this railing angry man, *W. Madox*, doth so often take it as a comparing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to three Apostles; herein he hath grossely wronged and abused me, and his own understanding. And his Charge of *Blasphemy* against me (for that he intimates that I should say) *That God is but equal with man*. I return back upon him as a most malicious horrid slander, and an apparent Lye against me. It was never my intent nor saying; for if I had said, That God is but equal with man, or compared the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to three Apostles, then had I and these ridgid *Presbyterians* accorded nearer than we did, for then had I owned their Doctrine and terms of *three distinct and separate persons* in the God-head, which are not infinite; which I can never own,

nor believe, nor depend upon any God, or thing, which is finite, for Salvation. Besides, I never denied finite man, nor three distinct Persons (as *Paul, Peter, and John*) to be distinct and separate Persons; so if I had really compared the Deity to such, we had not differed about the distinction of separate Persons, or finite substances in the God-head, which is no less than Blasphemy. But then, how poorly, maliciously, and falsely this *W. M.* comes off in so positively decrying their Doctrine and terms in these matters, to be *Scripture Truth*; and charging us with *designing to blast and over-*

*throw the Deity of Christ, and the Holy Ghost;*  
 \* *W. M.'s Rayling.* upon which, *Blasphemers, and blasphemy, and damnable speeches,* are hideously cast upon us, but most unjustly, and falsely; for no such design ever had we, as either to blast or over-throw the Deity of Christ, or Holy Spirit, we having openly professed and declared the contrary, both in words and writings. As also his accusing us *with boldly spitting in the face of God,* is a gross and malicious slander, and a presumptuous taking for granted, that our opposing their corrupt unscriptural distinctions, and vain babbling, was a *spitting in the face of God*; as if we must believe all what these men say, in this matter, to be as true as God is, and his Glory to be so deeply concern'd in their vain Philosophy: Judge whether they herein are competent Disputants, yea or nay? and whether these our opposers, or we, have compared God, or the Father, Son, and Spirit, to men; let the Reader judge by what follows.

1. In their Answer to that Argument of *W. P.*, viz. The Divine Persons are either finite, or infinite; if finite, then something finite is in God; if infinite, then there would be three distinct infinities, and consequently three distinct Gods: thus far *W. P.* Touching which, after they have denied *infiniteness* to be applicable or ascribed to them, (as to their substances or personalities, as they call them, they bring a comparison of the substance of a man, pag. 46. saying, *It would be improper to ascribe the property that belongs to him, unto his substance, to say that his substance in the abstract is either a learned or unlearned substance, a great one or a small*

\* *Presbyters vain & prophane babbling, confusion and blasphemous work.* *one, a white one or a black one* \*. What vain babbling, and a blind instance is here) And so they say, *It is improper to say, that*  
 either

either of the Persons, in regard of the personality or subsistence, are finite, or infinite; but in regard of their Essence in the concrete, are infinite.

Now the Reader at length may see what's become of their distinctions of three distinct subsistences, or persons in the God-head, or Divine Essence, wherein they having here undertaken to demonstrate that which Reason cannot demonstrate to them, nor they clear to themselves by demonstration, as in pag. 26. they have run themselves as into a Wood and Labyrinth, as persons bewildered and confounded; so as now the subsistences or distinct persons in the Deity, they so much contend for, are such as are neither learned nor unlearned, neither great nor small, neither finite nor infinite; what are they then? what Gods are they that these men would have us believe in? before they were not infinite, now neither finite nor infinite.

What grosse Confusion and Contradiction is \* Contradictions. here; for if not infinite, then finite; but the God whom we serve and believe in is infinite, the only Wise God, and nothing relating to him, or his, being finite. Howbeit since these our Opposers are contending for that which they cannot by Reason demonstrate, nor clear to themselves, pag. 26. It is very unreasonable in them to Impose it upon others to believe, without either reason or demonstration, or to pronounce them Blasphemers who cannot own their Doctrine and distinctions therein, to be agreeing to the Scriptures, whilst they cannot clear them (by Reason) to themselves, but both a mis-calling, and grossly mis-representing of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as one while with being not separate; another while neither finite nor infinite; instancing in the case the subsistence of a man, \* The Pit they have dugged for others, they are fallen into themselves. which they say is neither learned nor an unlearned one. They have accused W.P. with Blasphemy, who never denied the infiniteness of either Father, Word, or Spirit; but what greater Blasphemy can there be than their own? And now let the indifferent Reader judge what effect this kind of their vain babling would have in the minds of an Auditory, if this, God should be Preached in their blind confused terms; and if one of them should exhort People to believe in a Trinity of separate persons or subsistences, which are infinite in the concrete, but not infinite in the

*personality, or subsistence in the abstract*: Another while they are neither *finite* nor *infinite*; and what they are they cannot tell; for, by reason they cannot clear this their Mystery to themselves; Another while they are *three Hee's* that People must believe in, and therefore *three persons or substances with incommunicable properties*, by all which they go to demonstrate the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are *infinite in the Essence*, but not in their *Personallities*: They say another while, neither *finite* nor *infinite* as they say, what effect would this kind of Preaching have with People do you think? and where ever did the Apostles, and true Ministers of God Preach in this manner, or allow of such Philosophy in Preaching the Mysteries of God? Nay, did they not Preach in the simplicity of the Gospel, and Exhort in simplicity, as of the Ability that God gave? And did not *Paul* absolutely forbid such Philosophy and vain deceipt? And to avoid opposition of Science, falsely so called, *Col. 2. 8.* *1 Tim. 6. 20.* And are there not words sufficient in the Scriptures of Truth, to Preach God and Christ in, according to the plainness and simplicity thereof; but men pretending to be his Ministers, and Scripture their Rule, must thus run themselves into confusion and darkness by Humane Inventions and Traditions both of words, terms, and blind distinctions of man's fallen wisdom, which neither knows God, nor can rightly speak of him, but hath obscured the Glory of his Appearance from very many; but the Light is risen, and the Day dawned, which hath not only discovered, but will expel those thick Mists and Clouds of mens Inventions, that the simple may come to be undeceived and unvail'd; and so be delivered from such as these confus'd *Babel* builders that have made a prey upon them.

---

### CHAP. III.

*Something farther Observed, in Answer to Tho. Vincent.*

**N**OW let us a little observe some Passages and Arguments in *Tho. Vincent's Work*; For their distinctions about *Trinity of Persons* (as they call them). *distinguished one from another by incommunicable personal properties*. But such kind of distinctions and terms he hath not learned from Scriptures, but from humane Inventions; by



by which they have darkened the simplicity of Truth; as also he hath appeared as one in self-contradiction, when he saith, *That one should be in another; the first should be in the second, and the second in the first, and both in the third, and all one and the same individual Essence.* Now if they be in each other, they are not separate Persons as at the Dispute was affirmed; and if one be in another, where are the personal incommunicable properties, wherein they are not Infinite as they have told us? Is there finiteness in each person, and yet each person God; what gross darkness and blasphemy is this? But then to mend the matter, *T. V.* tells us, *This is such a Mystery as doth exceed the weak and narrow understandings of most inlightened and clear sighted Christians fully to comprehend; Some by gazing too long upon the Sun, become blind.* Surely then, if it be such a Mystery as exceeds the understanding of the clear sighted, it must needs exceed the dark understanding of *T. V.* and his Brethren; And seeing, as appears, he was conscious to himself of his own dimness or darkness herein as by what follows; also, he should have let it alone and not troubled his head with things beyond his reach; for he has confounded and marr'd his cause, and not at all mended nor cleared it; but if he hath assayed to demonstrate this Mystery, as he calls it, as one more clear sighted than the most inlightened, his Work doth manifest the contrary; And that *God cannot represent himself otherwise than he is*; It's true: but where doth he thus represent himself as these men do, with such invented terms, vain tautologies, and confusion? We do not read such in all the Scriptures of Truth: howbeit *T. V.* takes the boldness to Assert his Doctrine herein to be of Divine Authority, and to be the Truth of God revealed in his Word; and that if the Scriptures have revealed that there are Three distinct Persons in one Divine Essence, it is a certain Truth, &c: This is sooner said, than proved; if that Word of God, and Scripture could be produced that doth to reveal their Doctrine, and say, *there are three distinct Persons in one Divine Essence*: Produce us such a Scripture among all the Writings of the Holy men of God (in all the Bible) and it shall end the Controversie; otherwise let *T. V.* be ashamed of his Asserting it to be revealed in the Word of God. And of his saying that in his Syllogism, *pag. 13. There is not a word but what is to be found in the Scripture*; whereas neither the matter, manner, nor expressions of his Arguments are to be found in Scripture.

As for Instance his Argument ;

Page 13. *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are either three Substances, or three Manifestations, or three Operations, or three Persons, or something else ; but they are not three Substances, nor three Manifestations, nor three Operations, nor anything else ; therefore they are three Persons.*

To the first part ; Indeed they must be something ; to the Minor, if they be neither three Substances, Manifestations, &c. nor any thing else, this renders them nothing, and contradicts both the Major and Conclusion where they are something else, which is three Persons (he saith) so the tenour of his Argument runs thus, they are something ; but they are nothing (he meant nothing else but three Persons) therefore they are three Persons. It would have held better thus, but against himself. If the Father, the Word, and Spirit, be not three distinct Substances, then not three distinct Persons ; but they are not three distinct Substances, Ergo. unless he can show us a distinct person without its own substance : But his Brother T. D. saith, A person is *rationalis natura individua, substantia*, an individual substance, of a rational nature ; see how flatly T. D. and T. V. have Contradicted one another herein ; one affirming they are three Persons, because not three Substances ; the other, That a person is an individual substance : But if T. V. by saying, There is not a word in his Syllogism, but what is to be found in Scripture ; intends that every word particularly is to be found in Scripture ; the word *Substance*, the word *Manifestation*, *Operation*, *Person*, &c. abstractively, what proves this of this matter ? for the contrary may as well be asserted from bare words ; I never met with more silly kind of Arguing before : And if so be his other Argument from the Property of the Father to beget, of the Son to be begotten, of the Holy Ghost to proceed from them both, &c. be an Argument sufficient to prove Three distinct Persons in the God-head, with three incommunicable Properties, &c. Then doth it not follow as well, That every spiritual perfect Gift that proceeds from God to man ; must needs be a Person, and then so many Gifts, or manifold Graces as proceed from him (or are begotten by him) are so many Persons in him, which would be numerous indeed, and amount to a Plurality of Trinities ; for the Spirit is given variously, and in divers Manifestations, and the graces & gift of God are many and manifold ;

but

but the shallowness of this mans arguing, who is it cannot see, besides that Christ being the express Image of the Fathers substance, and the Spirit the Life of both; it's neither scriptural nor reasonable to say that the Image and Life of One and the same thing, should be either Two distinct and separate Persons from it, or from their own substance; so that still it follows, that if the Three bearing Record in Heaven, be One divine substance, and not Three substances; then not Three distinct or separate Persons: As also, God is called both the Word and Spirit.

Farther, Mark the manner of *T. V.* his expressing his Doctrine, viz. *The Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence, and the Unity of the Divine Essence in the Trinity of Persons, that three should be one, and that one should be three; that three should be distinguished but not divided, that one should not be another; the first should not be the second, nor the second the third, nor the second or third the first; and yet the first second and third the same, that the first should be in the second, and the second in the first, and both first and second in the third.* Thus far *T.V.* for his separate persons. Here you may see *T.V.* his invented un-scriptural riddle.

Reader, Do but mark his Jigg here, and what a whirling he has made like one distempered; but where is his Scripture for all this? see how he manages it, pag. 26. he saith, *Reason it may be will leave us in our search after the Deity in the Trinity, and the Trinity, &c. but where Reason faileth, Faith must supply its room.* And then tells us of *Mysteries which Reason cannot demonstrate to us, and that in this Mystery of the Trinity we must Exercise our Faith, though we cannot clear it to our selves by demonstration, &c.* But sure whilst Reason hath so much failed *T.V.* and his Brethren in this matter, that thereby they cannot clear it to themselves by demonstration, its very strange and unreasonable they should make such a stir in the dark, as they have done, to Impose it on the Faith of others; and what tends this to, but to force People to Exercise an implicate Faith, whilst they have neither Scripture, Reason, Demonstration, nor Revelation (for that's ceased they say) to ground a Faith upon in this matter, as he argues, viz. *If the Divine Essence, or God head, can be but One, and the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God, and they three distinct Substances, or Persons, then they*

*they are three distinct Subsistents or Persons; in the same single Divine Essence, but the Essence can be but One, and the Father is God, the Son God, &c. and they are three distinct Subsistents or Persons; therefore there are three distinct Subsistents, or Persons.*

Let the moderate Readers but mark this Argument, and whether it carries any matter, or weight of any proof or Argumentation along with it any more than an Empty Assertion: (Tautologies) begging the Question in the sequel of the *Major*, and so along still, taking the matter in Controversie for granted, which cannot be without better proof, and more convincing Arguments than *T. V.* hath patched up and produced; But as for the beginning of his Argument, That the Divine Essence, or God-head, can be but One, and this in each of the Three, we never denied; and *T. V.* has confessed it is not denied by us, pag. 28. But as for the rest of his Argument, it runs in the substance of it thus; *If they be three distinct subsistents or persons, then there are three distinct subsistents or persons; But they are three distinct subsistents, therefore, &c. Or, if they be so, then they are so; but they are so, therefore they are so.* I shall not need to say much, to shew what mean Logick this is, since it is from a Person whom Reason has so far failed, that he can neither clear nor demonstrate that to himself, which thus pitifully he has assayed to demonstrate to others. And so let the Readers judge if he be not such an one as he tells of, that by attempting to bring that Mystery to the Modal of his Reason, hath lost the sight, and sunk into grosse Apprehensions.

And as for his fierce Railing against *W. P.* and calling him, *wretched Blasphemer*, accusing him with denying that the Lord Jesus Christ is God, and with denying the Divinity of Christ and Holy Ghost, and with thrusting the Lord Jesus Christ off from the Throne of his God-head, &c.

I have not yet perceived any strength or weight of Argument from either *T. V.* or his Brethren, that has convicted *W. P.* as guilty herein; but rather the more they strive with him, and thus grossly revile him, and rail against him, the more their Folly, Confusion, and Weakness appears: And indeed if *W. P.* be supposed to be so grossly Erroneous as he is represented, it must be more Competent Antagonists than *T. V.* or such Railers as he, that must Convince him: But his shewing the absurdity of *T. V.* his Doctrines, and both

both unscriptural and unreasonable Distinctions; and his denial thereof, is neither a denial of the Son, nor Spirit, nor the Divinity of either; but the apparent falleness of these railing and slanderous Accusations before, with the Consequences thereof against *W. P.* In this thing, touching the Divinity of Christ, &c. appears in his own Book, *pag. 14* "Of Christ being the only God, and the Divine Nature being inseparable to each (whom they call) Person, have the whole Divine Nature, the Son in the Father, and the Spirit in the Son, unless the God-head be as incommunicable to this Person (so called) as they are reported to be among themselves, saith *W. P.* Doth not *W. P.* herein own the Divinity of Christ and Holy Spirit, let the indifferent judge how *T. V.* has wronged him.

And then *W. P.* his Admonition, *pag. 15.* saith, "Apply thy mind unto the Light and Grace which brings Salvation; that by obedience thereunto, those mists Tradition hath cast before thy eyes, may be expel'd, and thou receive a certain knowledge of that one God, whom to know is Life Eternal, not to be a divided; but ONE pure, intire, and eternal Being; who in the fulness of time sent forth his Son, as the true Light which enlighteneth every man; that whosoever followed him (the Light) might be translated from the dark Notions, and vain Conversations of men, to this Holy Light, in which onely sound Judgment and eternal Life are obtainable; (he) testified the virtue of it, and has communicated unto all such a proportion, as may enable them to follow his Example. [thus far *W. P.*]

Now mark, whether herein he has not owned the Divinity of the Son, when thus plainly he hath confessed to his Light, both as to its Extent and Virtue. And so as for *T. V.* his railing against us so bitterly, calling us, *black-mouth'd Blasphemers*; accusing *W. P.* with *Heathenism, abominableness, foulness*; falsely comparing him to *Arius* &c. These are but mean Arguments to Convince *W. P.* and doth but shew the malice and rancor of *T. Vincent's* Spirit; and what an implacable persecuting Spirit appears among these *Presbyterian* Priests? What cruel work would they make if they had power in their hands to persecute such as cannot be ryed up to their narrow Spirits and Principles; which is the same old persecuting Spirit that cryed for Fire and Faggot, after it put these names, *Blasphemer and Hereticks*, upon the Martyrs: And indeed, if any should be

lib disingenuous and drowned in their understandings by prejudice, as to think that the Absurdities that *W.P.* draws from his Adversaries Principles, are his own; they may be apt to charge him with Blasphemy, and what not, though falsely: But farther, how evidently hath *W.P.* in his 18, 19, 21 *pag.* owned and confessed Christ the Son of God, and his Light, and Grace, both for Remission of sins, Reconciliation, Salvation of men, Life Eternal; and as he is the only begotten of the Father, the Gift and Expression of Eternal Love for Salvation; Now can any thing have (or work) these Effects that is not Divine? Is not Christ's Divinity, Virtue, Divine Light and Power, plainly confest by *W.P.* herein, as also to his being God, *pag.* 21. How grossely have these angry *Presbyterians* wronged him in so hideously charging the contrary upon him; and are not they rather justly chargeable herein, with denying the Divinity of Christ, in letting so slight by his Light in every man, as they have done, one calling it an *Idol*; another Cautioning not to follow its guidance; But the Divinity of Christ, and the Honour due to him, far be it from us to deny, as these men have done; and the Scripture-instances in that case, we both know and own, *Joh.* 3. 13. *Rom.* 9. 5. *Phil.* 2. 6. *Heb.* 1. 8. *Joh.* 2. 17. *Heb.* 1. 3. *Joh.* 14. 1. *Phil.* 2. 10. *Col.* 1. 16, 17. *Joh.* 8. 58. But we are not convinced, that mens invented distinctions put upon Christ, does add any thing to his Honour, but rather diminish from it.

And where in *pag.* 31. it is said, *In regard of his humane Nature, the Jewes spoke true, Thou art not yet fifty years old; as Man, he was a Son of Abraham, and born many generations after him, &c.* Now I ask if he was not a Person as Man, and so born? And if there were three Coeternal Persons before, whether this doth not make a fourth? For as he was not fifty years old, this had no reference to his Divine Nature, as is confessed; But then, where in *pag.* 36. *The Generation of the Son must be Eternal, the Son being so: (they say)* How is his Personallity, with reference to his being begotten, denied to be Infinite? in *pag.* 45. What gross and apparent Contradictions are these?

And as to his instance, *Mat.* 3. 16, 17. how that Jesus went up out of the Water, and the Spirit descended like a Dove, and so a Voice from Heaven, to prove a distinction of all the Three Persons; *the Son was starb'd in Flesh, the Spirit in the shape of a Dove, the Father*



*Father was in the Voice, he saith, &c.* Let the Reader but mark how far short of proving his Distinction, this instance is: Surely he will not say, That the Son was clothed in Flesh from Eternity, nor the Spirit in a bodily shape like a Dove from Eternity; for if their Personalities did consist in these visible Appearances, how were they Coeternal, Coessential, Coequal with God, &c? And surely Personality doth not consist in the shape of a Dove, neither do we read of the Person of a Dove, besides the Spirit appearing in a bodily shape like a Dove, doth not prove that the Spirit was a distinct or separate Person from Jesus, for he had the Spirit in him; and was not separate from the Spirit, though that appearance like a Dove, was for a Confirmation to John's belief of him, *John* 1. 32,

33. *T. V.* (*Isa.* 6. 3.) *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts: the three Holies, signifies the three persons; the Lord of Hosts, the One God.*

I must confess I never heard this Argument before; if each Holy signify a Person, how then are they spoken to the One God? And if so many Holies as are given in praise to him, do signify so many distinct Persons in him, then they will amount to a great many Trinities; for it is said, *Rev.* 4. 8. *They rest not day nor night, saying, Holy, holy holy, Lord God Almighty, &c.* Now if all the Holies they give day and night to him, be so many Persons, then they will amount to Persons *ad infinitum*; but the absurdity of this Argument who cannot but see? As also his Argument from the distinct Names, is little better; for God is denominated under many Names more than Three; And also his arguing from *John* 14, 15, & 16. *chap.* from *personal Acts*, as he calls them, as sending the Comforter, his speaking and guiding, &c. Where doth the Scripture call them Personal Acts? Were they not Spiritual Acts of the Divine Spirit and Power of God? And was there any Act but what was brought forth in time? And was the Father's begetting the Son a Personal Act? (however was it not an Act in time) if so, how sayes *T. V.* That the Generation of the Son must be Eternal? What distracted confused work is here!

And as to that Cavil in *pag.* 40. at the word ONE, as not being in the Hebrew, in all those Scriptures, *Isa.* 40. 25. *chap.* 48. 17. *Psal.* 71. 22. where Holy One is mentioned in the English, which

the Cavil at, shews little prudence; whilst Holy One, and the Lord being One; and the Only Wise God, is often mentioned elsew here; see *2 Cor. 13. 9* which *W. P.* quotes; is it not *ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κύριος ὁ ὢν ὁ σοφὸς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ ἐκλεκτός* I re. *Deus unus & unus, Esus unus, One Lord,* and his Name One. And see *Dir. 6. 4.* how its *ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κύριος ὁ ὢν ὁ σοφὸς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ ἐκλεκτός* One Lord; but where the word *Echad* is not expressed, whether it be not understood? Besides, *T. P.* himself, *pag. 33.* useth these words, *The Lord of Hosts is One God*: so that he might have spared his Contradictory Cavil about it; And if their distinctions be in regard of the Personallity and not of the Essence, then I ask, Are they three Persons both distinct among themselves, and also distinct from the Essence or Being of God? and so not infinite; or neither finite nor infinite, as most Absurdly and Contradictorily is laid down in their 44, 49, 46; *pages*, as before, has been mentioned.

And as to *W. P.* his *Cloudy Brain Conceptions* (as it's called) which is so difficult to find out (as they say) and his Phrases so uncount, and his Reasonings so oddly joyned together: Indeed, neither *T. P.* nor *T. D.* have shewen any such Brightness, nor strength of Argument as to expel or drive away these cloudy Conceptions; if they be such, it must be another thing that must unvail him, and overthrow what he hath said, than their grosse Confusion, and many apparent Contradictions, which I am certain that *W. P.* is so far unvail'd, as to have a sight and discovery of, though this dark ridged *Presbyterian Spirit* hath sought by Persecution, false Reports, and Slanders, to vail and obscure both him and others, in whom any degree, breakings forth, or glimerings of true Light have appeared; where they could not do it by slandering, grossly villanying, and traducing them, they would endeavour to bring Persecution, and Cruelty, and outward Restraint upon them, to their Power.

And as for their taxing *W. P.* for instancing *Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Theophil.* and others, as appearing foreign to the matter in Controversie, &c. they telling us, *The Doctrine of the Trinity is plainly enough to be gathered from several passages in Irenaeus lib. 1. ch. 2. Ecclesia accipit fidem qua est in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem & in unum Christum filium Dei incarnatum & in spiritum Sanctum qui per Prophetas predicatus*: And then our Opposers ask,

ask, *Do not these words hold forth a distinction of those three persons?* To which I say, However he gathers or imagines such a distinction of their being three Persons, he does but beg the Question in calling them three Persons, which their words do not prove, nor so call them; but *God the Father Omnipotent, Christ the Son of God, and the Holy Ghost (in whom the Faith of the Church is)*. Neither do the latter words prove any thing for this purpose, which mention *the God of all things, making and governing all things by his word and Spirit*. If he had asserted no otherwise herein then *Irenaeus* hath done, there had not been this Controversie between us, and them. And as for the rest of the Authors they mention, I do not find that they called them *three distinct separate persons* (as *T. D.* did) in all these Passages mentioned and quoted by them; And its known that *W. P.* his Controversie was principally against them for unscriptural Doctrine of *the God-head subsisting in three distinct and separate persons*; which also their own Instance of *Theophil. lib. 1. Com. in Evang.* doth contradict, viz. *Margarita pretiosa est Sancta Trinitas que dividi non potest nam in unitate consistit*; the Holy Trinity is a precious Jewel, which cannot be divided, because it consisteth in Unity: To which I say then, the Glorious Three that bear Record in Heaven, are not three separate Persons; howbeit we are not bound to believe the determinations of Fathers and Councils any farther than they accord with the pure Language of Scripture.

And whereas *T. V.* and his Brethren, supposing that they have detected the weakness and absurdity of *W. P.*; thereupon go to Caution People, *Not to follow the guidance of the Light, which W. P. (truly) saith is communicated unto all, and forsake the true Light of the Word and Spirit, which alone can guide men into all truth.* This is a groundless Caution, and false as it reflects upon the Light; for suppose *W. P.* were in Weakness as they say, yet the Light is not the cause thereof; however his Weakness (as they call it) hath brought forth much of their Folly; for the Light which is communicated unto all, which People should follow the Guidance of, is the Light of Christ, which enlightens every man coming into the World; and therefore to render weakness, absurdity, falshood, and folly, as the Products of it, is both grosse Ignorance and Blasphemy; for the Light never changeth, however the Creature may; neither is this Light contrary to the Word, Spirit, or Scripture.

And

And as for their so much Railing against the *Socinians* and *Arian*s, and maliciously composing any of us with them, it is no reasonable way to Convince either us or them, if we were as ill as they render us, for they have gone the way to intimate and encourage both *Socinians*, and others, against them, and their absurdities, and ridged inveterate Spirits, and Railing against many that are of better Spirits (as men at least) than themselves. As for the *Socinians*, they have given ground to some to think the better of them, because they have shewn so much hatred and reviling against them; howbeit *Socinians* (if there be any that own themselves by that Name) may answer to their Accusations, it is not my work to maintain anothers Quarrel, nor yet to reflect upon their Persons, nor either to accuse or excuse them, to gratifie such incompetent Judges as these our Revilers.

I am not going about to gratifie Parties, or private Opinions (or man's Wisdom) on any hand, but to vindicate the naked Truth; yet, it's true, I have heard of some, beyond the Sea, that went under that Name *Socinians*, who were accused with denying the Divinity of Christ; but I know of none here, that either deny the Divinity of Christ, or Him to be of one Substance with the Father; if our Opposers do know of any such, they may tell them of it, and not accuse the Innocent with the Guilty, as they have done to us. However, it is but a mean way of Arguing, to accuse or mis-call any for owning any Truth that any sort (if they do Err in some things) do hold; for by that way, I may as well be reckoned a *Papist*, a *Jew*, or a *Turk*, *Episcopal*, or *Presbyterian*, or what not? because some Truths are held by them all, in words: But we had not our Principles either from *Armin* or *Socinus*, neither did we ever deny the Divinity of Christ (or his being of the same Substance with the Father) as *Armin*, *Socinus*, and others, are accused; so that therein we are very unjustly compared and misrepresented, for which I can say, *The Lord forgive these our prejudiced Opposers*. But it is no strange thing for us to be called by nick-Names one after another, by these and such false Accusers and incompetent Judges, for one while they were wont to Revile us for wanting Learning, being Illiterate, Lay-men, Preachers, &c. Another while they Railed against us, and falsely accused us for *Papists* and *Jesuits*. Another while they accused us falsely with being *Free-Willers*, *Armini-*  
ans,

and, &c. because we plead for the Free Grace of God to all men : And now we are falsely reckoned Socinians, and most injuriously accused with denying the Divinity of Christ the Son of God, which we are ever always clear of, still Confessing him according to the Scriptures, both in his Sufferings, Dominion, and Glory, who is the same yesterday, to day, and for ever.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Touching the Love of God in Christ, the One Offering, and how his being a Sacrifice for Sin is abused by us, according to the Scripture, and for what end construed or applied by these our Opposers, and their corrupt Doctrines, and Inferences to cover and maintain Sin and Imperfection herein of Life, under the notion of Satisfaction and Imputation, &c.*

SOME Presbyterian Priests, and Professors of other sorts also, affirming, That man having transgressed the Righteous Law of God, and so exposed to the Penalty of Eternal Wrath; It's altogether impossible for God to remit, forgive, or save man without a plenary Satisfaction, both by full Payment and Punishment laid on Christ the same that sinners deserve, which (they reckon) exceeds for sins past, present, and to come; So that though People live in sin, all their days (as Priests plead) yet they loath up themselves in sin, under this opinion, that all's done for them at once. But whether it be for all men, or but for some, T. Vincent hath not discovered, nor ingeniously opened the extent of their Belief and Principle in this matter, but has caught and snatched here and there, and then gone to his wonted course of grinning and snarling, by Reviling and Railing, having not Asserted, nor yet minded the End and Intent of his Opposer's Reasons (from Scripture) and Cautions in this matter, on the behalf of God's infinite Love, Mercy, and Grace towards lost man, which is judged

(and

( and not without cause ) these *Divine Doctrines* both edifice and lesson [ which we do not concerning the Sacrifice of Christ ] as *T. K.* falsely thinks ] as their saying *an Impossibility* in God in the case; against which many Scriptures were urged; as *Exod. 34. 16. 7. 2 Chron. 30. 9. Isa. 55. 7. Isa. 31. 31. Micah 7. 18. Mat. 6. 12. Job. 3. 16. Job. 16. 34. Rom. 8. 31, 32. 2 Cor. 13. 18, 19. Eph. 1. 7. 1 Pet. 5. 10. 1 J. 4. 9.* whereby, with many others, is proved;

1. The Lord God to be Merciful, Gracious to forgive Sin and Iniquity, and to pardon Transgression upon man, return and forsaking of his evil way, and that he retaineth not his anger for ever.

2dly. That it was Gods free Love and Grace to the World, to give his only begotten Son, that none should perish, but have everlasting Life, who believed in him.

3dly. That it was Gods Work to Reconcile the World unto himself, in Christ Jesus.

4thly. That the Benefits and Effects of Free Grace, and Love in Christ [ Jesus ] as Pardon, Remission, Reconciliation, Redemption through his Blood, &c. are of the nature and riches of this Grace, to all that truly receive it.

5thly. That this Free Grace of God, with its blessed Effects in the true Receivers, are not of Debt, Purchase, or Merit on the Creatures part, but free according to the nature of Free Grace.

6thly. That the Love, Kindness, and Goodness of God is perfect and infinite in him, and so in itself not to be added to, or diminished from.

7thly. That the Goodness of God where it takes impression, or is received in man in the free tinders of it in Christ Jesus, is the principal inducement, or cause of Repentance, and forsaking of Sin.

8thly. And the Tenders of Grace and Salvation [ in Christ ] are free to all, so that man's rejecting and slighting of it, and of Gods Kindness therein, is the cause of his being rejected of God. *O man, thy destruction is of thyself, but thy help is in me, saith the Lord.*

9thly. Seeing that many of their own Brethren have confessed God to be infinite, in his Power, and in all Perfections, and to his Divine Attributes (as their term is) and that he is free in them, and so his Love, Goodness, and Mercy, which attend his Judgment, being



being felt in the way thereof, by them that wait therein upon him; Why should a Doctrine or Supposition be brought forth, that doth at least seem to diminish his Love and Good Will, by either mis-representing it in its self, or render it partially in its extent, as only design'd (or but free) for a few, & that upon full payment, and also the same full punishment and wrath that sinners deserved, by a Person distinct and separate from himself as Jesus Christ hath been mis-represented, He being One with the Father, who said, *Hither to the Father worketh, and I work, and the Son doeth nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do, & that he doth.*

10thly. Christ being the Brightness of the Glory of God, and the express Image of his Divine Substance, as also truly called the Son of his Love; by him is express, and clearly signified, God's Free Love, Goodness, and Mercy towards Mankind, both in his Life, Ministry, and Sufferings in the days of his Flesh.

11thly. It being the Love, Patience, Long suffering of God, and Riches of his Grace that leads to Repentance, Remission, & all which were truly expressed, signified, and bore Testimony unto, by Christ Jesus, both in his Ministry, Suffering, and Death on the Cross, as also by his Resurrection, and most Glorious Ascension. The Almighty Power of God, which is unto Salvation to the true Believers, was shewed forth, and born witness unto; and blessed are they that receive the true sense thereof in its operation and effects.

12thly. I also know, and confess, That it was in God's Infinite and Free Love, that Christ gave himself a Ransom for all, to be satisfied of in due time.

And that in the same Love he hath given himself for us, an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour, *Ephes. 5.* and therefore God is to be followed, and Christ obeyed, by all that receive his Love.

But now to T. V. his Terms and Assertion, *Seeing he has not been plain, nor given any ingenious nor satisfactory Answer to I ask and Query.*

1st. **W**Here doth the Scripture say, That it is impossible for God to pardon, or forgive without a plenary Satisfaction, as an act of Law, made to his offended or vindictive Justice by another?

adly. And if this Satisfaction depend upon a second Person, or God equal with the Father, as (T. M. saith) Christ is proved to be, and not upon any finite creature, Is not this all one as to say, that God satisfied God? and then what need wee is it to lay it upon a second Person distinct from him, and yet equal with him? where doth he prove these words in Scripture? Doth not this, like the former Doctrine, either render them two distinct Gods, differing between themselves, the one abounding in Judgement, the other in Mercy; or else God to differ from himself, and so to give Christ for his own Pacification, and not Man's real Reformation; whilst the Notion of plenary satisfaction is made a cover or pretence for Peoples continuing in an imperfect, filthy, polluted state, which the Priests Plead for the continuance of, in all term of Life? And does not this their Doctrine lead People to despise the Blood of the New Covenant under foot, and this to deny the one Offering?

2dly. And was that the end of Christ giving himself a Ransom, being all Offering, and Dying for All, that men might live in sin all their time, and say they are Pardon'd and Redeem'd, whilst they are still in Bondage?

3dly. Is God fully satisfied that any should live in sin, or is his infinite Justice satisfied so, as not to lay hold on them in the final state?

4thly. If the Wrath of God be revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, and every disobedience shall have its just Recompence of Reward. How then is Divine Justice fully satisfied and answered for All in that state, without their coming under the sentence of it in themselves? For if so, then nothing is to be done with them; and then how did the Believers know the terrors of the Lord, the sentence of Death in themselves, the Law that Ministers Wrath, the Ministration of Condemnation, which in his time was Glorious, and the Righteousness of the Law fulfilled in them by Christ Jesus, who came to condemn sin in the flesh for this end; wherein still, we confess to the one Offering, and the blessed effects thereof.

5thly. And if All must live in sin all their time, does not this tend to settle People upon their Lewd, and set them at ease in a false security in Sin and Transgression, and so to deny the one Offering and Satisfaction put away sin?

6thly.



*Ans.* How then is God free in his Attributes, as they confess? and his Good Will shewed by Christ unto men for their good, in order to Salvation; for hath God two contrary Wills, the one obliging him to take Vengeance, or execute Judgement *\* Where then is his* to the uttermost upon All; *\* and the other,* to Exercise Patience, Forbearance, and shew *absolute Power and* Mercy; and so not to Will the Death of *several sinners so much,* Sinners, but rather their Return that they *profess* may Live: Is there any variableness or shadow

of Change in God; or rather, is not the Love and Good Will of God held forth in Christ to all men in the first place, and that then when he Chasteneth, Corrects, & Reproves any for sin, it is not in Vengeance or Fury, but in Love and Good Will; for his Vengeance is to fall upon his Adversaries, that have rejected and turned against him, and the free professors of his Love in Christ Jesus, and who have Crucified Christ unto themselves a-fresh, and trampled upon the Blood of the Covenant, and so despised the one Offering which was offered up once for all, as a real Witness of God's Good Will, Patience, Forbearance, Long-suffering towards all.

And now to T. V. his saying, *That Sinners must have Divine help to enable them to their duty, or in doing good; and when they have done their duty, their works are but imperfect, and they unprofitable servants; and so it brings* Luke 17. 10. *When you have done all the things commanded, say we are unprofitable servants, our righteousness is as filthy rags,* Ma. 64. 6.

*Ans.* If you, Presbyterians and Professors, were come to know a Divine help in what you do, and to do all the things Commanded, you would give us a better account of those Works and Performances brought forth by Divine help, than to compare them to filthy Rags: Divine help would cloath you with better Garments than filthy Rags. What sad Doctrine is this, to say the Good that is done by Divine help, and that doing all things Commanded of God, are but as filthy Rags? What darkness is this, not to distinguish between (self) Righteousness, which are but as filthy Rags, and the good that's done by Divine help, that hath a reality and splendour of God's Righteousness with it. Is this the construction you make of Christ's Satisfaction, or being a Sacrifice to God? that you must be cloathed upon, all your Life time, with your own filthy

Rags.

Rages of self-Righteousness. And then to cover over all these your *Babylonish Straws*, with a pretence of Christ's Satisfaction, paying your Debt for you, imputation of his Righteousness, deceitfully and feignedly applied by you to your selves in your filthy Rages, whilst you have no share in it, nor feel in you the Effect of his sufferings, as if you were only to believe, and apply, and sin all your time, you are far from the state of the unprofitable Servant that did all that he was Commanded: You are daily breaking the Commands of God, and Plead for it: much more farther from the state of those whom Christ called no more Servants, but Friends.

T. V. *That God never doth, nor will, nor can pardon any sinners without satisfaction made to his offended Justice for their sins.*

Reply. But then in Contradiction to himself; he saith, *I shall not constrain my self to inquire what God could, or might do, if he pleased*; Why then doth he say, he never will, nor can; and seem to lay such an Impossibility upon God in the case, as if he could not freely Pardon; whereas he could do whatsoever he pleased; and certainly, he could both please and satisfy himself.

And then I Query, How is this Satisfaction made by Christ?

T. V. *It depends upon him as the second Person in the Trinity,* pag. 54.

Query. Does it depend upon him as Man, or as God and Man?

T. V. *It was necessary that the Person that should make Satisfaction should be Man, because none but a Creature could suffer*: But then he adds, *It were necessary he should be God, otherwise the sufferings and satisfaction would have been but finite.*

Query. What then, were the Sufferings Infinite that the Wicked inflicted upon the Body of Christ, seeing nothing but a Creature could suffer, he saith, and yet as a Creature could give no proportionable Satisfaction to Infinite Justice: What Confusion is here? For as God, he could not Suffer nor Die, as is confessed; but God did strengthen the Manhood to bear up under such oppressions of Wrath: But where doth the Scripture say, That Christ the second Person in the Trinity, did suffer under infinite Wrath, either as God or Man, or both? He should have produced his plain Scripture, for Scripture we own, and Christ's Satisfaction as rightly stated, and what a most acceptable Sacrifice he was to the Father for All; yea, his Suffering as Man, or in the Flesh, without the Gates of Jerusalem

was all acceptable to God; his Son was also made an Offering for sin, and that he was a Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World; the Mystery, Virtue, and Effects of his Sufferings, none knows but they that believe in his Name, and receive the Righteousness of Faith. But indeed the manner of *T. N.*'s stating the business, I do not see that sense can be made of it, whilst he makes it a Payment of a second Person distinct from God, and yet not as a Creature; for as such the Sufferings were finite as he saith, that could not bear a proportionable Satisfaction to infinite Justice, and then it being as God united that did bear up and strengthen the man under oppression of Wrath that made this Satisfaction, as he hath stated it, &c.

*Obj.* What amounts this to, that God made a satisfaction by and paid himself either by inflicting infinite Wrath upon Christ as God (which cannot be) or else that he satisfied himself by the finite Suffering of Christ as man, when as that *Confusion and Distractions.* which was finite could not satisfy infiniteness (they say). And as *God-man* can, they say he was the subject of Wrath or vindictive Justice (as their term is). How these things should be reconciled, I leave to the ingenious Readers to judge.

*John.* Yet still we know that God was ever satisfied and well-pleased in Christ Jesus and in all his Works, and it was God that was in him reconciling the World unto himself, and Christ is the Son of his Love; and it was out of his Free Love that he sent him into the World: His sending Christ surely was his own Free Grace, and no man's Purchasing, and then his Love was openly testified of, when Christ was come, who came in that Free Love of God which was testified and held forth in Christ Jesus to man, and he gave himself a Ransom to Redeem and Purchase man out of Transgression, and not to let him lye in sin and imperfection all his life-time; the Good Will of God in sending Christ, in delivering him up for man, and giving him for a Propitiation for the sins of the whole World, and his tenders of Free Pardon, Remission, and Redemption in him, was, that man might receive Christ, and come into the full enjoyment of *||* Living Faith, and be partaker in himself of those *¶ Per a life in say* precious benefits, & Heavenly Privileges, which *is* God? *remits* in Christ; so that man should live in sin *his*



his time; for an Act of Free Pardon is not granted, that men may take liberty to live in Sedition and Treason all their life; but for those Offences past: Nor that men should Plead, that all Offences past, present, and to come, are Pardoned; therefore they cannot be free from Rebellion, Sedition, and Treason all their Life time; this were a sad Consequence and not to be born; then you that plead a Satisfaction made to God, extending thus far your sin and imperfection term of Life, being in you the ground of this Plea, and also that which you cover and maintain by it, and then when God and Christ require true Repentance, perfect Obedience, Righteousness, &c. you tell God the Debt is paid, and all satisfied by another without you; How then do you Answer the pure Law and requirements of God within?

*Priests.* We endeavour and strive and profess and their Answer, viz. *we don't believe it is attainable here.*

*Reply.* Then your endeavouring and striving is all in the unbelief, How do you endeavour and strive?

*Priests.* We Pray, and seek God in Ordinances, and perform Duties.

*Query.* But what doth all your performances amount to, while Perfection is denied, and Sin contended so much for by you?

*Pr.* All our best performances are sinful, we had need to ask forgiveness for the sin of our best Duties, of our Prayers, and all other Performances; See our Directory, Catechism, &c. So that all our Righteousness, in our best state, are but polluted and filthy Rags, Dross, Dung, &c.

*Query.* How now Professors, Do you thus requite God for his Love? and is this the use you make of your Plea for a full Satisfaction and Debt paid for you? do you thus requite the Lord, and answer his requirements, will he accept of these things at your hands?

*Pr.* God looks not upon us as we are in our selves, but upon Christ's Righteousness in his Active and Passive Obedience, whereby he fully satisfied for us.

*Query.* What then, Do you think that God will be satisfied on your parts with your filthy Rags, rotten Clouts, Dross and Dung, which you offer to him; or will he not rather call it a mockery or wring at your hands, thus meanly to requite him? what do you

you signifie for him? Was this the end of Christs suffering for Man, and his being a Sacrifice well-pleasing to God, and a Propitiation for the sins of the whole World; did he appease Wrath, fulfil Righteousness, bear the Sins, or the burthen of them, in his own Body, that men might take this liberty to Sin, Pollution, Rebellion term of Life, and so live all their time in Disloyalty, and without subjection to him; and then, when he requires Obedience of you, and to answer his pure Law in the heart, you go and offer a few rotten Clouts, filthy Raggs, Dross and Dung, and such nauseous stuffe to him; will not he return it upon your own faces as a mockery and contempt done to him? *Behold, I will spread Dung upon your faces, even the Dung of your solemn Feasts,* Mal. 2. So it may be justly said, *Even the Dung of all your best Performances, feigned Humility, feigned Confessions, feigned Prayers, feigned Pretences, feigned Applications, feigned claiming an Interest in the Satisfaction and Imputation of the Righteousness and Obedience of Christ, whilst you are out of it, clothed with your own rotten Clouts, and filthy Raggs.* And if a People should deal thus with their Prince, after he has granted and given an Act of Free Pardon and Indemnity, that they should both take liberty to Rebellion and Treason, and not only so, but Plead for it as you do for sin term of Life, and tell People, they must lay hold, and apply this Pardon; but they must not expect to be free from actual Rebellion against their Prince while they live; How would this be taken, and what ungratefulness and unworthiness would this import on their parts? How would they be acquitted before him? Nay, if they should go to requite their Prince by spreading a deal of rotten Clouts before him, and a deal of Dross and Dung under his Nostrils, every day, upon his Table; and not only so, but publickly in the sight of the People once or twice a Week at least (as you do your sinful Prayers and Performances) would not this be taken as an high Affront and Indignity put upon a Merciful Prince? Judge what would be the effect hereof? Nay, if you should present an Oblation before him mixt with Poyson and Infection, and he know it to be so, what would be your recompence! And do you not present your sinful Prayers and Performances before the Lord, from your sinful polluted hearts, which are deceitful, and desperate wicked above all things, and therefore full of deadly Corruption and Poyson; will your feigned

feigned Humility, feigned Applications stand you in any stead here-  
in? Bring no more vain Oblations before the Lord, offer it to  
thy Prince, and see if he will accept thy Person, *Mat. 23. 35.*

That the Son of Man came to give his Life, a Ransom for many;  
and that he is the Propitiation through Faith in his Blood; and that  
in due time he died for the ungodly, bave our sins in his own Body  
upon the Tree, that he was wounded for the Transgressions of the  
People, that he hath loved us, and given himself for us an Offering  
and Sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour: See *Mark. 10. 45.*  
*Rom. 5. 6.* *1 Pet. 2. 24.* *Isa. 53. 5.* *Rom. 3. 25.* yea, we own and  
confess to Christ in his Suffering, being an Offering dying for the  
ungodly, more than you *Presbyterians* do. First, as to the Universal  
Love of God shewed forth therein. Secondly, As to the Virtue,  
Power, and Effects of his Death, Sacrifice, Blood, &c.

First, In that he Died for *All men*, for the Ungodly in general;  
tasted Death for *every man*, gave himself a Ransom for All, to be  
testified of in due time; that he is the Propitiation for the sins of  
the whole World, which you say is but for a few, only, for a select  
number, the World of Believers, &c. as both *T. D.* and other Pro-  
fessors, both *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, both in Words and  
Writings; and *T. V.* brings *1 Tim. 2. 6.* and mentions only *gave*  
*himself a Ransom*, and leaves out the words for *All*, pag. 56. And  
thus minces, as if he had no mind to hear that Grace is free for All  
as well as himself, but only for a few perhaps *Presbyterians*, and  
such-like, whom there is no reason or equality for God to take such  
special notice and regard of, more than others; for their Spirits and  
Hearts are as perverse and corrupt as others, if not more ridged and  
envious; and their Garments of Self-Righteousness, are as polluted,  
ragged, and filthy as others, or worse; Thus much they will ac-  
knowledge in their Prayers; but perhaps they'll take it ill that ano-  
ther should tell them of it.

Then Secondly, The Power of Christ and his blessed Effects in his  
Death, acceptable Sacrifice, &c. we own more than they; for he  
gave himself to Redeem Man from Sin and Transgression, and the  
servitude of it; and his Blood purgeth the Conscience, cleanseeth  
from all sin; his Flesh is given for the Life of the World, that Man  
may come to rise out of sin, and live again to God in perfect Right-  
eousness; God hath set him forth to be a Propitiation, through

Faith, in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness for the Remission of Sin past, through the Forbearance of God; Rom. 3: 25. He doth not say, for his past, present, and to come; and that all must be sinful and imperfect all their days; and yet all forgiven, God being satisfied in Christ for all, whilst he is not satisfied in them, but his Spirit daily grieved; where as Christs Appearance was to put away sin by the Sacrifice of himself; and if it was to put sin away, to cleanse man from it, and not that he should say, that only the Guilt is done away, but not the Act and Pollution of Sin, which is the gross corruption and false construction of *Presbyterians*, and others.

And as to T. P. his wonder at W. P. his challenging any Person to give him one Scripture phrase which doth approach the Doctrine of Satisfaction. But T. P. has deceitfully left out his following words, viz. "Considering to what degree it is stretched (the degree whereof it is stretched by these Priests, is mentioned before) not that we do deny, but really confess, that Jesus Christ in Life, Doctrine, and Death, fulfilled his Father's Will, and offered up a most satisfactory Sacrifice, but not to pay God (as others will being unable to save men) (Rom. 8: 3.) And further adds, "And so for a Justification by an imputative Righteousness, whilst not real, it is merely an Imagination, not a reality, and therefore rejected. "Otherwise (that which is real, which is the Righteousness of Faith really received and enjoyed in the true and Living Faith) is confessed and known to be justifying before God, because there is no doubting in Christs Love, without keeping his Commandments; but therefore Faith in, and Union with him, is Love, not longer to deceive thyself by the over-sound embraces of Humane Apprehensions for Divine Mysteries, but rather be informed, that God hath bestowed a measure of his Grace on thee and me, to shew us what is good, that we may obey and do it; which if thou diligently wilt obey, thou shalt be led out of all unrighteousness, and in thy obedience shalt thou receive Power to become a Son of God, in which happy estate God only can be known by Men, and they know themselves to be justified before him, whom experimentally to know by Jesus Christ, is Life Eternal. "So that the infinite God, in his infinite Love, Good Will, Kindness, Patience, Forbearance, Long Suffering, fully expressed, declared,

clared and signified by Christ Jesus, the Son of his Love, and express Image of his Divine Substance (not a separate Person from him); and Gods good Pleasure and real Satisfaction in him; and all for the regaining, restoring, redeeming, and saving of lost man to himself, out of the fallen estate, out of sin and corruption, and from Wrath to come; this we know, really own and confess in the Light and Life of the Son of God bestowed upon us; which is that alone that can give the true knowledge of the blessed Effects of Gods Love in Christ, and of the Righteousness of the true and Living Faith in his Name and Power; as also of their true Peace and Satisfaction, receiving the Attainment, Reconciliation and union with God in Jesus Christ, who is the Way, Truth, and Life, to all that truly believe in him.

*Q. N. In the Scriptures, he is alleged against Christ's Satisfaction.*

*A. P.* Not that we do deny, but really confess, that Jesus Christ in Life, Doctrine, and Death, fulfilled his Fathers Will, and offered up a most satisfactory Sacrifice.

*Q.* This clears him from all trading Scripture against Christ, or what was really his Satisfaction, which is fully acknowledged.

*A. Y.* God proclaims himself so, by gracious and merciful, whereby he declares what he is in his Son, whom he had before promised to give, and in whom alone all Nations of the Earth, that ever should obtain his favour, were to be blessed.

*Reply.* His giving his Son, and his Father, and Blessedness in him, proceeds from the Graciousness and Mercifulness of God; how then does this agree with that of Impossibility freely to Pardon; and with that of his being obliged to take Vengeance upon all, and yet ready to forgive? and that he hath engaged himself to do it; pag. 60. Can this be deemed to be of the Nature of Debt, full Payment, Rec by the rigour and punishment of Law. Secondly, If that it be in the Son of God alone, in whom God declares what he is, and in whom alone his Favour and Blessing is obtained, then in him is the knowledge both of his Judgment and Mercy; and if blessed in Christ, it is not blessed out of Christ, nor merely for what he hath Suffered in the Flesh, without being in him; for we are accepted only in the Beloved as is confessed; and God is well pleased with us, only in Christ, then not with us in sin: And if so be God



proclaims himself to be Gracious and Merciful in his Son, how was God's infinite Wrath, that sinners deserved, inflicted upon him, as a Person distinct from him? Where does the Scripture say so? Or were it good Doctrine to say, that God so loved the World, that he hated his only Son? How then was he the Son of his Love, who freely gave himself to bear the sins, sorrow, and burthen of all?

*T. V. (Pag. 52, 53.) I grant that God's Love of Benevolence, or Electing Love, is not the Effect of Christ's Satisfaction, from whence it was that he sent his Son into the World for our Salvation; but his Love of Complacency was the Effect of Christ's Satisfaction, Matth. 3. 17.*

*Reply.* Where doth the Scriptures use these Expressions, or this distinction of an Electing Love, and Complacing Love in God? Is there any Love in God that is not well pleasing unto himself? or that is not of his Good Will, or Benevolence, which is consent to be saving? Or if this Love of Complacency (so termed) was the Effect of Christ's Satisfaction, and not the other, then was it not in Being in God before? But if you say his Love of Benevolence (so called) or Good Will, was only intended for a few, or a certain select number, and for them only he received Satisfaction, or was Pacified, doth not your Doctrine herein render him partial and unequal in his ways? whereas he willeth not the Death of sinners, but rather their Return, that they may Live; and God's Love, Good Will, Patience, Long-suffering, Forbearance, and Goodness is towards all, in the first place, till men reject it, and is manifest in Christ towards Mankind, and evidently testified both in his Sufferings, Dying for all men, and giving himself a Ransom for all, to be testified of in due time, and that by his Righteousness the free Gift of God came upon all men; It is not said in Scripture, that God's Love of Benevolence was to the Elect only, or that Christ died for a few only, or was given a Ransom for Believers only; but for All, though All do not accept of the Good Will of God towards them, nor of the Offering or Price which would purchase them to God, out of their sins, and thralldom.

*ST. V. Whether it is any satisfaction, to say, that God should be at the Charge of his own Satisfaction? Job 33. 24. I have sinned & Ransomed.*

*Reply.*



*Repl.* In that place cited, he should have set down all the *verse*, where it's said, *He is gracious unto him; and saith, Deliver him from going down into the Pit; I have found a Ransom, (or an Attenument,)* so that it's manifest, that this Ransom was all from the Graciousness of God, manifest in God's delivering Man from going down to the Pit, after that Man is chastened with Pain, *vers.* 19, 20. and his Flesh consumed under the sence of God's Judgments, then a Ransom is found through God's Graciousness to him, who delivers his Soul from going into the Pit, that his Life shall see the Light, *v.* 28. To all these things oftentimes worketh God with Man, to bring back his Soul from the Pit, to be enlightened with the Light of the Living, *vers.* 29, 30. Surely *Elihu* knew more of God's dealing, and of his enlightenings thereby, than they do who put his Work a far off from them, and oppose his Light within, being neither willing to wait under his Corrections, nor bear his Judgments, till they feel his Graciousness, and partake of a Ransom thereby, from the Power of Sin, Death, and Hell; and to tell of God's being at the Charges of his own Satisfaction; how does that agree with the former Doctrine, That he never will, nor can Pardon, without Satisfaction made, &c. If the Graciousness and Satisfaction was in himself before, surely what was performed by Christ for man, was an effect of God's Graciousness to bring man to himself; and it's without Controversie, that all that is in God, and all the Gifts and Benefits proceeding from him to man-wards, as also all his Works are acceptable and well pleasing to himself; but his Works man ought not to put a far off from himself, since that those things which are for man's deliverance, and preservations of his Soul out of the Pit: God worketh with man, and he hath wrought all our works in us, *Isa.* 26.

And as for Believing and Obeying his Precepts, as a *Concurring Cause of Remission*; *T. V.* calls this *Rant Popery*, as importing *Justification by Works*. \*

\* But *J. Owen* confesseth otherwise, That God requireth Faith and Repentance in Sinners antecedently to their Participation of Pardon.

*Repl.* What was said in that case, was sufficiently proved from Scripture, and not at all refuted by *T. V.* when upon man's Return to God, forsaking his evil way, and believing in Christ, the

( 3 )  
the Lord has promised Pardon, not to turn away his face, but to shew Mercy, *Act. 13. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.* This is no Popery at all, no dissent from Scripture, and to confess the receiving of Remission through Repentance, and Justification through Faith, and that God hath wrought all our works in us, and this we confess to, and truly own, though unjustly we are accused for Popery.

And if Grace and Justice be very well consistent, as I confess'd from *Rom. 3. 24. 25. 26.* I ask how this consists with your sense of Vindictive Justice else where? And the Lord saith, *I am a just God, and a Saviour, there is none beside me, Isa. 45. 22.* So he that is a just God, is a Saviour, and in this was manifest the Love of God towards us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the World that we might Live through him, herein is Love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a Propitiation for our sins, *1 Joh. 4. 9. 10.* Now we knowing the Life and Power of Christ, and having partaken both of the saving Vertue, and blessed Effects of his Sufferings in the fellowship thereof in Spirit, as also of the benefit of his Mediation and Intercession; we must needs Confess him in all, and the Love and Graciousness of God through all.

And whereas T. H. accuseth W. P. That his *enumerating some of the Ends of Christ's mission into the World, doth reach no higher then by his setting him forth as a perfect Example.*

Reply. Herein he hath wronged and belyed W. P. For in his Book *pag. 9. 16. 17. 18. 19.* W. P. brings several Scriptures, both to prove God's Love and Graciousness in giving Christ, as also the benefit of Christ to man for his Reconciliation, Redemption through his Blood, Salvation, and Eternal Life, through him, which is higher, or more then being a bare Example; for hereby its evident, that he was not only a perfect Living Example of Good to Man, but a Minister and Giver of it, as also the Worker and Author of man's Salvation.

As also W. P. in his *19. pag.* Confesseth, That Christ, as being Attributed, in his Doctrine, Life, Miracles, Death, and Sufferings to God, as the Gift and Expression of his Eternal Love for the Salvation of men.

And thus I have shew'd that the Lord is a just God, and a Saviour, and that he hath wrought all our works in us, and this we confess to, and truly own, though unjustly we are accused for Popery.

and abolishing that other Covenant which consisted in External and shadowy Ordinances; and that made none claim concerning the Confidence.

2dly. In promulgating his Message of a most free and universal Tender of Life and Salvation, unto all them that believe and follow him (the Light) in all his Righteousness; the very end of his Appearance being to destroy the works of the Devil, the which every man comes to experiment, as he walks in a holy subjection to that measure of Light and Grace, wherewith the Subjects hath enlightened him.

3dly. In seconding his Doctrines with Signs, Miracles, and a most innocent self-denying Life.

4thly. In Ratifying and Confirming all, with great Love and holy Resignation, by the offering up of his Body to be Crucified by wicked hands, who is now ascended far above all Heavens, and is thereby become a most compleat Captain, and perfect Example.

*Obj.* Here Christ is confessed to, as the Gift of God's Eternal Love, for the Life and Salvation of men that come to receive him, and his Appearance to destroy the works of the Devil, which his own Light and Grace maketh manifest, as it is believed and waited in, and so Christ is the Leader and Captain of such, and is made unto us Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption.

And I ask, who are those *T. V.* saith, *That the Lord extendeth his special Mercies to* And, whether is Mercy extended to All, in sending his Son into the World; and what more special Mercies can there be than the only begotten Son of God who is given for a Light, for a Leader, for a Covenant, for Life and Salvation, that whosoever receives and believes in him, might receive the blessed End and Privilege of his Coming and Manifestation, to wit, Life and Salvation in him, from Sin, Death, and Destruction.

And whereas *T. V.* in pag. 65. brings an Instance, *That the Soul cannot see without the Body for want of an Organ; and that therefore the God separately cannot satisfy, because he cannot suffer; and man separately cannot satisfy, because the satisfaction would not be of infinite value; yet as God-Man he is satisfied, &c.*

*Reply.* Do but mark what an Instance and Comparison he has here brought in Competition with the Infinite, Omnipotent God; to shew us, that God separately cannot satisfy any more than the

Soul can see without an Organ : And who is it that God cannot see? Is he himself? Can he not satisfie or please himself? Is he ever divided or displeased with himself? What gross darkness appears in this Comparison, Instance, and Assertion, to say *God cannot see, &c.* and thus to bring the Infinite God, and his Infinite Power under the Limitations of finite Creatures : Is this any less then Blasphemy? let but the indifferent, judge in this case : Have not these our Opposers been ready to call us Blasphemers but for bringing an Instance to shew the absurdity of their Doctrine, where this is an Instance from a finite to an infinite, tending to lessen the Infinite Power of God.

And as to his telling, *That the Soul cannot see without an Organ*, I am sure that's not true, though he meant outwardly, yet it hath a spiritual sight.

As to his saying, *That God cannot suffer*, is in one sense not true, though he intended as to Death, yet the Spirit of God hath suffered, and hath been grieved by man's Transgressions : The Rebellious Jews grieved and vexed his Holy Spirit, until he became their Enemy, and fought against them, *Isa. 63. 10.*

And did not the Lord say, *Behold, I am pressed under you as a cart is pressed that is full of sheaves*, *Amos 2. 13.* So did not he suffer, in being pressed by them then, and did not he say, *My heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together, I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim, for I am God, and not man, the Holy One in the midst of thee*, *Hos. 11. 8, 9.* Did not herein his Suffering and Forbearance declare him to be God, the Holy One, and not man, rather then the Execution of the fierceness of his Anger? And was not God's being grieved by the rebellious Jews a Suffering, when they hardened their hearts, and provoked him in the Wilderness; for he said, *Forty years long was I grieved with this generation*, *Psal. 95.* therefore *saying if ye will hear his voice, barden not your hearts*. And did not God suffer long by the old World before he destroyed them, seeing when he saw their wickedness, *it grieved him in his heart*, *Gen. 6. 6.* Also he said, *His Spirit should not alwayes strive with them*, *verl. 3.* So that his Spirit did suffer, and was grieved by them before they were destroyed. Again, How oft did they provoke him, and grieve him in the Desert? *Psal. 78. 40.* And did not he Complain against the People when

when they were *Rebellious and Polluted*, saying, *Your new Moons and your appointed Feasts my Soul hateth, they are a trouble to me, I am weary to bear them*: Was not this trouble, and being weary with them, matter of Suffering? and was not this his Suffering for some time before he did ease himself of his Adversaries, and avenge him of his Enemies: See *Isa. i.* And also it's said, *Chap. 7. 13. Hear ye now ye House of David, it is a small thing to weary men, but will ye weary my God also?* And *Chap. 43. 24, 25. Neither hast thou filled me with the Fat of thy Sacrifices, but thou hast made me to serve with thy sins; thou hast wearied me with thy iniquities; I, even I am he that blot out thy transgressions for my own sake, and will not remember thy sins.* (Mark) *for my own sake*; So then surely God could satisfy himself, seeing it was for his own sake that he blotted out Transgressions; and here the infinite Value, Ransom; and Satisfaction was in himself, and what Patience, Forbearance, Long-Suffering, and Forgiveness, as was signified by Christ (and testified of by his outward Suffering and Death) was really in being in God before, and in the fullness of time a signal testimony thereof given to man, to induce him to receive the free Love and Grace of God, and Life and Salvation in the Son of his Love.

*T.V. Who do ascribe more Grace and Mercy to God than we, who do apprehend it in his Son, pag. 65.*

*Reply.* Indeed your apprehensions in that matter, are sufficiently manifest before; had *T.V.* added, Who do apprehend more Grace and Mercy in God, then we that say he cannot satisfy himself, and Christ as man, could not satisfy him by finite Suffering; and the Grace we ascribe, we apprehend it, only to extend to a few, a select number, &c. Had *T.V.* spoke this plainly together, People might the more easily have judged, whether he has truly ascribed or apprehended concerning the Grace of God, and whether many thousands do not ascribe more Grace and Mercy to God, that own it in the free and general Extent of it to all men, than he hath done.

Again his confessing, *That God doth execute his Justice freely, as he doth love his Image in his People freely, yet both are necessary, because Natural, and neither forced nor compelled by any External Agent.*

*Reply.* So, here's a better Confession then much of his Work before, and it contradicts much of it. For, 1st. If his Love be as free

as his Justice, and neither compelled, neither forced by any External Agent, how then is he obliged to take vengeance upon all that have transgressed, when upon Repentance he readily pardoneth and passeth by former offences; and how then is it impossible for God freely to Pardon. 2dly. What is that Image in his People he loves freely, is it perfect or imperfect? if perfect, then how do they deny the perfection of any thing within, or that's inherent in the Believers; and if he loves his Image in his People freely, then he is satisfied in his own Image, and that which brings to know and enjoy this Image, and the renewing of it within, is that which brings into Love and Union with God, which is his Divine Spirit and Power, that renews man into the Heavenly Image and Righteousness of the Everlasting God, which they that enjoy, have the acceptable Sacrifice, and from thence can present Living Sacrifices unto God, to his Eternal Praise.

And to T. P's saying, *That if Christ were not punished for us to satisfy God's Justice, it would follow from W. P's words, that Christ should be a sinner, and that he was punished for his own sins.*

*Reply:* That's a blasphemous Consequence indeed, but not truly charged upon W. P. for he never intended by his words to render Christ a sinner, nor that he was punished for his own sins, for he never sinned, but he was Punished and Suffered by sinners, who by wicked hands (and so by their injustice) put him to Death, and under the burden and weight of their Transgressions he Suffered, as also his tender Spirit that made Intercession, and suffered for Transgressors, from a fore-sight of the Wrath that should come upon the Rebellious; and was not the Wicked the Instruments that wounded, bruised, and afflicted him, and that oppressed his Righteous Soul? And did not his Innocent Life, and Righteous Soul, suffer under a great oppression and weight of man's Transgression, when he was in his Agony, and sweat drops of Blood, before his being Crucified? And so was not his Suffering two-fold, both Inward and Outward? And then if so, that the pure Life and holy Spirit suffered, as bearing the burthen of their sins, and if the God-Head being in Christ so nearly united, as to bear up the Manhood under the Suffering (as is confessed) How then can it be deemed that God inflicted the punishment of Eternal Wrath or Vengeance on his Son? Surely his permitting wicked men, by their wicked hands,



to punish him with a Temporal Suffering and Death, could not be his Eternal Wrath or Vengeance, which is supposed to Answer and Satisfie Divine Justice for man, and so to acquit man Living and Dying in sin (a great Error) from Eternal Wrath; whereas Christ Jesus was the Son of his Love; were it not inconsistent to say, That God's Justice did punish or execute Wrath upon his Love? Seeing that it's confest, *That Grace and Justice are very well consistent, and that there is a free Exercise both of Justice and Love, without force or compulsion*: How does T. V. his matter hang together! Let the moderate, judge. But had he stated it in the Language and sense of the Scriptures of Truth, there had not appeared this Contrariety nor Opposition, either between us, or with himself: For Scripture accounts concerning Christ and his Sufferings (for sinners) both inward and outward, I do own, and Confess to, and have a reverend Esteem of all his Sufferings, and the worth thereof; and do greatly prize his Meekness and Humility, who hath freely condescended according to the Good Will and Pleasure of God (not from Wrath nor Compulsion) to offer himself a Lamb without spot to God, to bear our griefs and sorrows; yet (saith the Prophet *Isaiah*, chap. 53) *we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted; but he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our Peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed; he was oppressed, he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth, he was brought as a Lamb to the slaughter; he made his Grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his Death, because he had not done violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth; yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief, when thou shalt make his Soul an Offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his dayes, and the Pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.*

This is he that hath been despised and rejected of men; This is he who hath been as a Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World; This is he men have evilly entreated, and evilly requited, for his kindness and good Will that

*This being God's Pleasure in both, where do the Scripture, call it his Vindicative Justice upon him, as T. V's words are; which J. O. and T. D. call Vindicative Justice; but by what Scripture we know not; for the Scripture calls it, the Chastisement of our Peace that was on him.*

he hath shewed forth towards them; This is he whom they have caused to suffer by their iniquities, and so thereby have shewed great unworthiness and ingratitude towards him and his Father, whose Pleasure and Good Will he came to perform; both in his being delivered up to undergo Afflictions, and Bruises, and many hard Sufferings for Mankind; and surely God was in him Reconciling the World, even in, and through that low and suffering state, which the Righteous Seed, and renewed Plant of the Lord hath undergone; but now what effect hath all this Love, Tenderness, and Compassion of God, in, and through Christ, upon and in man, whilst Sin, Transgression, and Imperfection term of Life is pleaded for by the Priests? Surely they herein do not make a right use of Christ's Suffering, but both reject him, and the End thereof; and this was not the use that the true Ministers did make thereof; for they witnessed that he died for all, that as many as lived should not live unto themselves, but unto him that died and rose again, 2 Cor. 5. 25. and his own self bare our sins in his Body on the Tree, that we being dead to sin, should live to Righteousness; this was not a living to sin, nor pleading for Imperfection, as *T.V.* hath done; who farther adds, *via.*

*The 7th Consequence is childish, and a shame that a man that pretendeth to any brains, should mention it, That though Christ hath satisfied for us, the Debt remaineth still to Christ, pag. 66.*

*Reply.* Is this such a childish, shameful, or brainless Consequence, that the Debt remains still to Christ? Has not *T.V.* herein shewed his Ignorance of Scripture? for ought not Christ to be obeyed who is the Author of Eternal Salvation to them that obey him, *Heb. 5.* and we are not under the Law to God, but under the Law to Christ; and to what end is his spiritual Law written in the Heart, and his Spirit in the inward Parts, but to be obeyed; and we are Debtors not to the Flesh to live after the Flesh, *Rom. 8. 12.* to what then, but to live after the Spirit, and through it, to mortifie the Deeds of the Body, *vers. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.* The Apostle was far from pleading for sin and Imperfection as Priests do, for which God will judge them by Jesus Christ, to whom all Judgment is committed, who hath Power to proclaim the Day of Vengeance, as well as the acceptable year of the Lord.

The

The truth of it is, *T. V.* has Confessed to what *W. P.* has writ in many places, but to his own Contradiction; but here he falls a railing, and vilifying him with such terms, as *Abominable Worms*, &c. He has not at all dealt fairly or honestly by him, having left out, and not stated his Arguments, and then rails against his Consequences; whereas he, and his Brethren, would not be so dealt by.

*T. V.* Take away Satisfaction, then the Word, and Spirit, and we are false Witnesses; then is our Preaching vain, and you are all yet in your sins; then you must all of you, of necessity, be damned and punished Eternally.

*Reply.* Truly so they are like to be, for all the help they are like to have from your Preaching, especially if their being yet in their sins be a sign of it; and that you are false Witnesses, and your Preaching vain; for so they are like to be in their sins all their Life time, if they believe and drink in your sinful Doctrine for sin and Imperfections remaining in all, term of Life.

And as for *T. V.*'s bitter storm he brings forth, of accusing and charging *W. P.* in the same words that *Peter* said to *Simon Magus* the Sorcerer, or Witch, *Acts* 8. 9, 21, 22, 23. and as having no part in *Christ's* Satisfaction, and his heart not being right in the sight of God, and to be in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity: And further adds these words, to render him worse, viz. *Wicked Blasphemies, and Abominable and Heretical Assertions.*

I hope *W. P.* will easily bear such vilifying without reviling again, there being no matter of Argument nor Proof in them, either to Convince, or terrifie him; and for the matter of Judgment against him, he can Appeal to more Competent and Moderate Persons to judge in the case, than *T. V.* hath shewen himself.

*T. V.* Pag. 67. *God hath engaged to keep Believers out of a Course of Disobedience; and if they do transgress in some particulars, he hath threatened to chastise them, which is not inconsistent with Christ's satisfying his Justice for their sins, since chastizing is not an Act of Vindicative Justice, but Fatherly Love.*

*Reply.* Here observe, 1st. That Chastizement, and Revenge, are two things. 2dly. If they be to be Chastized for Transgression, it is to bring them into more subjection to God, and conformity to Christ, and not to leave them in sin, and Imperfection, term

of

of Life, under a Plea of the Debt being fully paid, and full Satisfaction being made for them, by Christ's under-going Wrath and Vindictive Justice; which, how do these stand with Free Grace, Goodness, Pardon, Remission, &c. upon Repentance? 3dly. How does T.V. suppose Vindictive Justice, or Eternal Wrath inturied by many Offences, to be laid on Christ, which is not Chastizement as confessed; and so he makes full Satisfaction the Effect of God's full Revenge on his Innocent Son; as if one should say, That God could not command Wrath, but were bound thereby till he had Executed the Extremities of it upon Christ (for so it hath been deserved by sin and sinners) as if he had not absolute Power to shew his Love, Good Will (and Satisfaction therein for his own Names sake) And is not this to render God more cruel than man, or his Prerogative below that of Earthly Princes, which is best known in shewing Mercy and forgiveness: God *can do whatsoever he will*, and his Will is chiefly to that which he most delighteth in, to wit, Goodness, Mercy and Forgiveness, that he may shew himself Gracious for to restore man to himself. And he saith, *I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the Spirit* \* *The Souls that he hath should fall before me, and the Souls that made, his Justice doth not I have made,* \* *Ma. 7. 16.* And T.V. with-hold pity from them to gain upon them, stating it, as God's Revenge, or Vindictive Justice on Christ (and the Chastizement only on the Transgressors) is

not Scripture, *Is. 53. 5.* for it saith, *He was bruised for our Iniquities, and the Chastizement of our peace was upon him;* (Mark) He was bruised, and the Chastizement of our peace was upon him: It is not laid, *Vindictive*, or rather *Vindictive Justice*, or the Revenge of our Peace was upon him; for T.V. has Confessed a difference, and Chastizement comes in Fatherly Love, and not Revenge; *O Lord correct me, but with Judgement, not in thy Anger, lest thou bring me to nothing,* *Jer. 10. 24.* And now this Correction; or Chastizement from the Lord is known by his People in the time of their spiritual Travel and Warfare, that they may be partakers of his Holiness *Heb. 12. 9.* and perfect Righteousness, as they have partaken of his, *11.* Christ's Sufferings, and known the Fellowship thereof; But, and if men continue in Rebellion against Christ, rejecting his Love, and Grace; his Sufferings, and Satisfaction, will

will not free them from the severity of God, nor from the Execution of his Judgement, which is given to Christ to do, who hath also Power and Authority to Execute Judgement, because he is the Son of man that hath suffered, and is that man by whom God will Judge the World in Righteousness, *Joh. 5. 22. 27. Acts 17. 31.* and by whom the secrets of men shall be judged according to the Gospel, which he and his Ministers have proclaimed, which is the acceptable year of the Lord (to them that receive it, who have thirsted after it) and the Day of Vengeance of our God to them that reject the Love of the Truth, and hate to be Reformed; how highly never they may boast of Satisfaction, and Imputation, &c.

## CHAP. V.

*Touching the Presbyterian Priests (and Professors) Doctrine of the Justification of the Ungodly, by an imputed Righteousness; and T. V. his Plea, and Proofs for it, Examined.*

**F**irst, he brings *2 Cor. 5. 21.* for his Proof, *viz. He hath made him to be sin for us, that knew no sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him; (to which he adds) as Christ was made sin for us, though Innocent, by the imputation of our sin to him, for which he was condemned and punished; so we are made the Righteousness of God in him, though guilty, by the imputation of his Righteousness unto us, whereby we are Justified.*

*Reply.* Here *T. V.* has given us their sense of Imputation, *viz.* That Guilty Persons are made the Righteousness of God in Christ, and so Justified, whilst in their sins, by the Imputation of his Righteousness; as much as to say, when they are really unrighteous and actively sinners, yet imputedly Justified, and made the Righteousness of God in Christ, which is a false and corrupt meaning put upon the Apostles words; for there's no Unrighteousness, no Guilt, nor Impurity in Christ, for in him is no sin, \* *It was Christ's Persecutors that charged, or imputed Sin, Guilt, and Blasphemy to him; and so such they are that impute Righteousness to wicked or sinful Persons.*

made

made a Curse, or Sin for us; the Scripture doth not say *So we are made the Righteousness of God in him*: For if these words, *As he, So we*, which are added, were true, the Consequence would be *As he was made to be sin for us*, who knew no sin, nor ever could sin; *So we are made the Righteousness of God in him*, who never knew Righteousness, nor ever can be Righteous: What a gross corruption and perverting of Scripture is this, and how contrary to the Righteousness of God, to suppose guilty, and sinful Persons to be Righteous, whilst such; as if God's Righteousness, or Workmanship, were impure: This Doctrine has led many in the way to Hell and Destruction; But *T. V.* in *2 Cor. 5.* should have read *vers. 17. If any man be in Christ, he is a new Creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new.* Which is a real change in that man that is in Christ, from sin and transgression, and not a Justification therein; for the Spirit of God both discovers to man his sin, and reproves him as a transgressor, and one Guilty whilst therein; and surely God does not accept of men, as his own Righteousness, and in Christ, whilst his Spirit in them judges them to be both unrighteous and out of Christ; for if he did, that were to make God contradict himself, and to speak quite contrary to his own Spirit, which were very absurd; and blasphemous to assert: But had *T. V.* rightly minded and understood that of *Rom. 8. 1, 2, 3, 4.* he might have seen how contrary it is to his Doctrine before, and himself therein confuted: For, 1<sup>st</sup>. They that are in Christ Jesus, walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit; and its to such only to whom there is no Condemnation, therefore Justification; and this is not a sinful, imperfect, or guilty state. 2<sup>dly</sup>. The Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, hath made such free from the Law of Sin and Death. 3<sup>dly</sup>. God sending his Son to condemn sin in the Flesh, was not to look upon man Justified in the sinful state, or whilst he walks after the Flesh. But, 4<sup>thly</sup>. That the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in such who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit; and this doth absolutely confute *T. V.* and his Brethren. And whereas for the proof of his Doctrine of Guilty Persons being the Righteousness of God, he citeth *Rom. 4. 6, 7.* where it is said, *David described the blessedness of that man to whom God imputeth Righteousness without Works*; to which I say, not without the Works of the True and Living Faith in Jesus, nor yet without a subjection



subjection to the Law of Faith, but without that, the Works of Deeds of the Law of Works, *chap. 3. 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28.* the Apostle did not exclude the Works, Obedience, or Righteousness of the true Faith, from a justified state; for if *Paul* had so done, it had been contrary to *James* his Testimony, who said, *Was not our Father Abraham justified by Works, when he had offered up Isaac?* See *Jam. 2.* And Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness; We say, That Faith was reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, *Rom. 4. 3, 9.* which Faith was not without its own Works, although it be not the Works of the Law, as Circumcision, and others, that were Types or Signs, wherein the Righteousness of Faith doth not consist, which they that are in the uncircumcision (as the Gentiles that were the ungodly, spoken of, *Rom. 4. 5, 11. chap. 3. 29.*) do receive through Faith in Christ, and become really partakers thereof, being Justified from all those things from which they could not be Justified by the Law of *Moses*. And so such are Justified or made Just, or truly so Accepted of God, not in sin, or ungodliness, but as Redeemed out of it, and Sanctified from it. See *1 Cor. 6. 11.* And blessed are they whose Iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin*; This is no Proof for *T. V.* his sinful Doctrine; for them whom the Lord doth bless, and imputeth not Iniquity to, are in the way of God, and partakes of his Righteousness through Faith, &c cannot feed upon an imagined Imputation or Justification in sin; for in *Psal. 32. 2.* David describeth the blessedness of such in these words, *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not Iniquity, and in whose Spirit there is no guile*: These words (*in whose Spirit there is no guile*) the Priests use to leave out in their talk of Imputation, but as their Faith without Works (or a real Obedience on the Creatures part) is but a dead, empty, and feigned Faith: So their laying a claim to, and pretending a Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ, whilst they are sinners, and polluted, pleading for Imperfection whilst here, 'tis but a false imagination of their own; for, though we confess that Justification is in the Righteousness of Christ, by Faith in him, and that this True and Living Faith, and the Righteousness of it, is reckoned to the true Believer; yet we do not therefore grant that Sinners, or Polluted Persons in that state, are clothed with this Righteousness, nor that 'tis imputed to them

them as theirs, whilst they are out of it; for they that have put on Christ, are translated from sin and unrighteousness, and so are made partakers of the Righteousness of Faith, which *T.V.* saith is without us, and so puts it a far off, and yet cites *Phil. 3. 9.* which plainly Contradicts his Doctrine; for *Paul* having confessed Christ Jesus to be his Lord, and suffered the loss of all things, that he might win Christ, it was that he might be found *in him*, not having his own Righteousness, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith, that (said he) I may know him, and the Power of his Resurrection, and the Fellowship of his Suffering, being made conformable to his Death, *vers. 9, 10.* (Mark) his winning Christ, being found in him, his not having his own Righteousness, but that of Faith extends to a real injoyment of Christ, and his being in him, and not to an imagined Imputation in sin, but to his knowing Christ, and the Power of his Resurrection, Fellowship of his Suffering, and Conformity to his Death; this was a blessed estate, which all you that plead for Sin, and Imperfection, and a Justification, whilst you are out of Christ, or strangers to him, being both unacquainted with his Power and Fellowship of Suffering, and never came ye so to be conformable to his Death, you being yet alive in your sins.

And as to *T.V.* his Argument, or Syllogism, it proves nothing of his Doctrine of *impure or guilty Persons being Justified by Imputation*, for Justification by Faith in Jesus Christ, and his Righteousness we never denied; but this Faith is not a dead Faith, nor without its own Works, for it purifieth the heart, but so does not your Faith, who plead for sin, by which you apply Christ's Righteousness, whilst you are out of it, and it *without you*, as *T.V.* confesseth *pag. 17.* How hath he, and the rest of you, that own this his Doctrine, soothed and daubed People up in their sins, flattering them with a Pretence of Imputation and Justification therein, when your Faith is but dead, and empty, as a body without a Spirit is dead.

That *we are Justified by Faith, without Works*; By what Faith, and without what Works, is mentioned and manifest according to Scripture, both in that to the *Romans*, as also in that to the *Galatians*: See *Rom. 3.* & *4. chap.* and *Gal. 2, 3, 4, & 5. chap.* that they were the Works of the Law (and not the Works of Faith) without

without which they were Justified. And as of his telling of the *Deficiency of Righteousness inherent*; I say, that Christ's Righteousness within, is not Deficient, who works both perfect Sanctification and Righteousness in true Believers; and what is the end of seeking for a Righteousness without ( as *T. V.* saith ) if they must not really enjoy Christ's Righteousness within? And where do the Scripture say, That they may seek for Christ's Righteousness Imputed without themselves? How proves he this by Scripture, &c. his saying they can be Justified only by Faith, whilst he excludes (its Works) it's contrary to the Apostles Doctrine, *Jam. 2.* Faith if it hath not Works is dead being alone, and ye see how that by Works man is Justified, and not by Faith only, *vers. 17. 24.*

*T. V. Which Faith he putteth in opposition to all Works, not only of the Ceremonial and Moral Law, but also to all Works wrought in Faith, which are works still, such as Abraham's Works, and David's Works were,* pag. 70, 71.

*Reply.* The Justifying Faith which is Living and Real, was never put in opposition to its own Work ( by either Christ, his Apostles, or Ministers ) nor to all or any Works wrought in it self, by any, but Antichrist, and his Ministers, such as *T. V.* and his Brethren have manifestly shewn themselves to be, in this and other particulars. For the Apostle *Paul* was so far from putting Faith in opposition to all Works wrought in it, that he saith, *Do we then make void the Law through Faith, God forbid; yea, we Establish the Law, Rom. 3. 31.* And if while we seek to be Justified by Christ, we our selves also are found sinners; is therefore Christ the Minister of sin, God forbid, and I through the Law am dead to the Law, that I may live unto God, *Gal. 2. 19.* Now this Living unto God, being Crucified with Christ, was by the Faith of the Son of God, which Living unto God, was in the Righteousness of Faith, and not in sin, for Christ is not the Minister of sin; so that he doth not set Faith in opposition to its own Works, as most falsely is affirmed; but to those Works, whether of the Law, or other self-Works, or Righteousness, that were out of the True Faith, which purifies the heart, gives Victory, Sanctifies, and Justifies; and the Saints knew the putting off the body of the sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ (so that they did not carry a body of sin all their time about with them) and a being buried with him in Baptism, wherein also they

they are risen with him through the Faith of the operation of God; who hath Raised him up from the dead, *Col. 2. 11, 12.* And that God would fulfil the Work of Faith with Power, *2 Thes. 1. 11.* This *Paul* prayed for; so he did not set Faith in opposition to its own Work; As also *Heb. 11.* how amply is the true Faith (without which it's impossible to please God) demonstrated by the many Works, and blessed Effects of it, which did attend it in God's People, in their acceptable obedience and subjection to him, both in Doing and Suffering, concerning which, both *Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Joseph, Moses,* and many others, are instanced for their faithful obedience and subjection.

As also the Apostle *James, chap. 2. 20, 21, 22.* plainly Contradicteth *T.V.* his putting Faith in opposition to its own Works, where in he might as well have put it in opposition to itself: Who farther adds, from *Rom. 4. 2, 5.* touching God's Justifying the *T.V.* ungodly, That *no Persons, being the Subjects of the Gospel Justification, but as ungodly.*

*Reply.* Herein again he has wrested Scripture; for the Apostle doth not say, he Justifies them *AS* ungodly, but *he that believeth on him that Justifieth the ungodly* (it's not *as* ungodly) which were the believing Gentiles that were so ungodly (there intended) before they came into the Work of Faith, and to partake of its Righteousness within, for they were not Justified in ungodliness, but from it; *Justifieth* is not *Justified*; the one being the Work *a doing*, the other *done*; which where it is so Effected by Faith, that purifieth the heart, therein the real Subjects of Gospel-Justification are manifest, not *as* ungodly, but *as* Righteous, being Washed, Sanctified, and Justified by the Spirit of our God, and that in the Name and Power of the Lord Jesus, *1 Cor. 6. 11.*

Moreover, *T.V.* hath Confessed, That God doth not leave them ungodly; where he removeth the guilt of sin, he removeth also the filth of sin; Justification and Sanctification being inseparable companions, and that Justification is never without Sanctification, pag. 70.

*Reply.* It's well he has somewhat inclined to Confess to Truth, though to the manifest break-neck and overthrow of his own Cause; For now, What's become of his Justification of the ungodly, of the Guilty *as* ungodly, &c. by the imputed Righteousness of Christ? (as his words are) And when was that performed?

formed or wrought? Now, not till Sanctification be known, that the filth of sin is removed; Justification and Sanctification being inseparable companions, and the one never without the other. And surely people are not the subjects of Sanctification, or Sanctified; *as* ungodly, or *as* in the filth or pollution of sin; let the Readers but mark here how flatly this *T. Vincent* hath overthrown and contradicted himself, and his corrupt Doctrine; for an Imputation of Righteousness to the Unrighteous, and a Justification in Sin and Transgression, *as* ungodly; &c. whereas he that Justifieth the Wicked, and he that Condemneth the Just, they both are abomination unto God, *Prov. 17. 15*. And of this our Adversary is greatly guilty.

And as for *Tho. Danson's Synopsis*, which he so highly commends, as that *the use of it may be great, for the Establishing of Christians in the Truths, &c.*

By this he does but shew his own shallowness and weakness; to Commend thus highly of such a silly confused piece (which hath also many Lyes and Falshoods in it) as that sorry Pamphlet of *T. D's*, as it will further be manifest; and how apparently both *T. V.* and *T. D.* have Contradicted themselves, and each other, even in their principal Points.

And as for his putting off *S. E.* his Challenge to *Fast and Watch, as a Tempting of God, and a God provoking sin, to endanger self-murther*: And judges him, *as being Mad, and numbred amongst distracted People.*

Indeed this is as smooth a put off, and excuse, as he could readily have imagined, to excuse himself from Fasting, &c. so that his Accusing *S. E.* as being Mad, Distracted, &c. does neither prove him to be so, nor does it destroy either *S. E.* his Confidence or Motion in the matter, but sets it the more over *T. V.* and his Brethrens heads, who are afraid their God should fail them, and to enter upon this Engagement; especially whilst *T. V.* Confesseth, That *the Scripture Instances of Fasting many dayes together were Miraculous*: And surely, whether *S. E.* had not Power, or a particular Motion (not Imitation) to have Answered his own Proposition in that case, of Fasting (if he had been tryed) *T. V.* does not know, because he durst not put it to the tryal.

And.

And as for T. H. his Railing, and Reviling the *Quakers*, and Charging them with being, *Black Mouthed, Blasphemous Hereticks, with damnable Errors*. These are no proofs against us, but do manifest his Enmity; as also his Answers to his feigned *Queries* against us, are but his own Forgeries, without either Reason, or proof of any of them; therefore returned back upon his own head, and denyed by us.

## His *Queries* and *Answers* against us, runs thus; viz.

### Query 1. Do you know what you are?

1st. You are Strangers to Christ, whatever your fancy be of Christ within you.

2dly. You are Enemies to Christ, and I believe that Christ hath scarcely greater Enemies under the Sun, than you.

3dly. You are Children of the Devil, and the Works of your Father you do, and will do.

4thly. You are Serpents, and a generation of Vipers, full of deadly Poyson, Poyson in the Head, the Poyson of damnable Errors; you are Serpents putting forth your stings.

### Query 2. Do you know where you are?

1st. You are in the Devils School.

2dly. You are in the Devil's Arms, he huggeth you so fast that it's more difficult to pluck you from thence, than the most wicked and profane.

3dly. You are in the Devil's Chains.

### Query 3. Do ye know what you are doing?

1st. You are dishonouring God.

2dly. You are murdering your own Souls, imbruing your hands in your own Blood, you are some of the greatest Soul murderers of any that live upon the Earth.

Query 4. Do you know whether you are a going?  
You are going the certain way to Hell.

Thus



Thus far *T. V.* in answer to himself; but his outrage, and big words against us, does not at all terrify us; nor are his bare Assertions any Proofs: And whether he has not shewn great wrath, bitterness, and enmity, and put forth a Serpents sting here in the tayl of his Pamphlet, let the moderate Reader judge: And whether *T. V.* in this his outrage, be a Person to be believed, yea, or nay? Or his severe Judging, harsh Censuring of us, to be taken as for one in Christ's stead and Judgement Seat, whom partly he presumes herein to personate, as he saith, *If our Saviour were on Earth, he would silence as he did the Pharisees*; but in this he has presumed in Christ's Name, and in his Name uttered his own slanders against the Innocent, for which a day of account will come, which will be heavy upon him; and such false Accusers, if they do not Repent; and if his eyes were open, he might see himself guilty of the same things, whereof he hath accused and judged others: Who in the end of his Book repeats again what he did before Assert, *That it were better for you to drink a Cup of Poyson, than to suck in the Quakers damnable Opinions, &c.* If People will be such silly Women, as to be affrighted with *T. Vincent* his Railing and Slanders against us, and his swelling words of vanity, so as to think the worse (or be more afraid) of the *Quakers*; It will be the way to keep them in slavery and bondage under him, and such as he is, thereby to be made a Prey upon; for he, and such, seem more offended, when some of their Hearers, that have gratified them with Rewards, or are somewhat Rich, are like to forsake them and turn to the *Quakers*, then with all the threatnings they can devise, they'll endeavour to detain them, as this *Tho. Vincent* has publish'd, *That it was worse to go to the Quakers Meetings, than to a Bawdy-house.* What think you, his Hearers, and the rest of his Brethren, Were these words favoury; and did they become his Profession, yea or nay? What sayes *Joh. Owen*, *Tho. Danson*, and *William Maddox* to it? Let Honesty and Truth in All, arise and judge.

Ah! poor passionate *T. Vincent*, thou hast brought such a blot and brand of Infamy upon thee (by thus peevishly busying thy self against the *Quakers*) that will not easily be wiped off: Consider thy wayes, and what thou art a doing, before it be too late.

# ERRATA.

**P**Age 10. line 23, 24. read *as if infallible.* p.25.l.10. for *Essences* r. *Effence*. p.25.l.4. & 11.r. see *Arias Montanus*. l. 5. f. *Os-isk*. r. *Osajik*. p.30.l.11.r. *gifts*. p.33.l.9.r. *Persons*. p.36.l.3.r. *ma* p.37.l.4.f. no r. *do*. p.40.l.9.r. *man's return*. p.45.l.32. & p.46.l.11.f. *op-  
pressure* r. *a pressure*. p.48.l.20.f. that they r. *if they*. p.52.l.14.f. *complacent*. l.36.f. whether r. *neither*. p.57.l.11.f. *Contradicts*. p.60.l.28.f. not under the Law to God, r. *nor without Law to God*.

*The Errors and defects of the Press, whether they be Words, Letters, or Points, the moderate Reader may easily see, and Correct, by the Import of the Discourse.*

**An**



into the Powers that then were, against the Quakers, he was plainly manifesting; and his Errors and Falsities detected by those faithful Servants of Christ *Samuel Fisher*, *Richard Hubbertson*, (and my self) he might now have been silent from raking over his old folly, confused with his former answers and confuted, since that from the entire Confutation, and just reproof and discovery made against him by *Samuel Fisher*, he could not yet clear himself, nor hath essayed a Replication thereto, but only a slight put off, as will appear, without either Truth or Reason: and as for his commendation of the pains of his worthy Friend *Master Thomas Vincent*, as he calls him, he has little ground to applaud his pains; for he has not only manifested his own errors, confusion and contradictions, but also his unchristian and uncharitable passions against both himself and *T. D.* so that they should first have sought to bring in Amicitia and harmony between their own Churches before they had come thus publicly to engage; but it is the Judgement of God upon them, and such giddied spirits, that will stoutly oppose and contradict another till they are both overturned and broke to pieces in their own way, but if his worthy Friend *Thomas Vincent* had done so worthily against the Quakers, why doth *T. D.* take so much pains again after him? why doth he utter words, as he saith? his Answer is, because of some reflection upon him, also that an experience hath formed here in a great deal of dissension; *Samuel Fisher* and his friends *Richard Hubbertson*, and *Thomas Vincent* are the most acceptable to him, he saith, by which it appears that he was confidently or at least jealous that his worthy *Master Vincent's* work would not be so acceptable as his own, but would give dissension; and therefore he has endeavoured to smooth it over, and to recommend him another phrase, according to what he has imagined and wanted about *W. W.* and old Authors, both Popish and others; but what saith he for not answering *Samuel Fisher's* Book against himself, *Jo. Owen*, *Barnard Tynan*, *Enriched Ruffin*, and *Academy* which they were never able to answer, nor to reply to? *T. D.* answereth himself as followeth, viz. If my Quaker *Ant. Bond* why did not answer *Samuel Fisher's* Book against himself, is it for want of wit? or for want of grace? Answer, that I answered it is my right duty; and I answered it as I saw the necessity that *Ant. Bond* has a Bundle of imperfections in his work, which I have answered.

Indeed

disputed this in every way of answering, which if we should  
 deal so with T. D. what would he say to it, and to such answers  
 but this doth not clear himself from *Samuel Fisher's* Answer, but it  
 stands on his head; and if he will contend by other persons then  
 himself in not answering J. F. those other persons are either as  
 plain as light see T. D. to be baffled and confuted, that it was  
 his aim to drive any further; and if other persons then him  
 strive thus, in that case he should have followed the example  
 of, so as not to have meddled, as he hath done, to the  
 mistaking his weakness and folly; and as for his instance of  
*some service against the Holy Ghost's Deity*, is no precedent  
 instance for us, as is most manifestly manifest to all who  
 vnderstand the *Diction of Divinity* or either, *Patet*, *Word*, or *Dei*  
*Constat*. And how could he expect the Reader to be so easily  
 thus deceived by such a weak and trifling instance as he  
 as he falsly saith, what man give the understanding thereof, if not  
 the Light of Christ within? and how must sacred scriptures be  
 known? and what must bring to the right use of reason, and to un-  
 derstand the Scriptures, if immediate Revelation of inspiration be  
 supposed necessary in these days? Can the natural man with his  
 natural understanding know the things that are spiritual, (surely  
 no) or know the right use of the Scriptures without the guidance  
 of that invisible Spirit that gave them forth? no sure; for it is the  
 Inspiration of the Almighty that giveth understanding. And *Scripture*  
 also that T. D. confesseth, that *though this is the Nature of the Word of*  
*God above all words, and that God will not be*  
*comprehended by a Creature*; which, if so that the Nature and  
 Wonders of God are above his and their reach and comprehension,  
 why hath he essayed so much by his natural understanding to define  
 and distinguish the *Godhead* and *Trinity* and *Persons*, which he  
 has no Scripture for, nor yet Reason so demonstrate, nor Re-  
 velation to ground? Faith upon in that case, whilst the *Revelations*  
 were wont to affirm Revelation to be ceased, and to be sure God  
 will not put the Seal of his immediate power to a falsehood, as is  
 confessed, so that whilst we have neither Revelation, Scriptures,  
 Reason nor Seal of immediate Power for their Doctrines and argu-  
 ments put upon the Bible, we have ground at least to question  
 them if not positively to oppose them as unscriptural, irrational,

implicite Doctrines and Traditions, which hath sented to us both the glory of God, Christ, and Holy Spirit (which we confess) of most people.

And now to T. D's definition of the word Person; first, from *Aquinas* as being an individual substance of a rational nature; but his worthy Friend Th. Moore hath denied the Father, the Word, and the Spirit to be three Substances; then I ask how they can be three distinct Persons, whilst a Person is an individual Substance? what contradiction is this? But then T. D. saith; Some think it, (*see Aquinas his Explanation of Person*) liable to some exception; and therefore he chuseth to borrow that of learned *Warron* (see pag. 2. that a Person is an individual Substance or Substance, either as an individual entity, or a formal or singular thing, that subsists by itself, &c. *A Man is not a Person; a Person is not* *substantia* *with Reason, and understanding, which is singular and distinct from another; a Person is entity of itself, &c.* pag. 12. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

Concerning which I query first, whether the Father, the Word, and Holy Spirit be three several and singular things, that subsist each by himself, each one from another yea or nay?

Secondly, whether a man being a Person, is a competent instance for proof of his Maker being three several Persons? and whether a man subsists by himself?

Thirdly, whether Christ be several and distinct by himself from God, and the Holy Spirit, several and distinct from both? If yes, where, or in what place of the whole world (or out of it) is the one entire and several from the other? and how far distant one from another?

Fourthly, And if the Father Son and Holy Ghost, do not subsist in a several and distinct nature of the same kind, (so as they are not three Gods) as is confessed pag. 2. how are they three distinct or separate persons, subsisting each by himself?

These things being considered by the impartial Readers, the absurdity of the *Presbyterian* Doctrine and Comparison, touching the Deity, will easily appear.

And what was this *Aquinas*, quoted as T. D's Author, so much cited and commended by him, as a wise Observer, pag. 29? Was not he a great Writer for the *Roman* Religion, and the Pope's Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and so a promoter of Popery in his time,



time, and canonized him Saint among them? see his large Volumes, his *Sermons*, and others; he is highly applauded by the Papists, as being an *industrious Promoter of their Faith and Religion*; and was he not a Dominican Fryer? To whom it appears that T. D. is very much beholding for his Doctrine, [of three distinct (or sever'd) Persons in the Godhead] more then he is to Scripture; for that is silent concerning it; but I have of late Read it in *Aquinas his Smons*, who is *Tho. Dawson's wife Obsequant*.

And further (mark) that after T. D. has confessed, *that the word Person cannot be properly attributed to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that the Names common to God and the Creatures do signify something wherein the Creatures bear some analogy to God, and three Persons, one finally, yet analogically in the Godhead*, pag. 3, 4. Where proves he this by Scripture? and wherein doth man bear a proportion or likeness in his Person with his Maker? this is strange Doctrine, importing that the Diety hath the resemblance or likeness of persons, but not properly; which, if improperly, why do they stand so much upon their improper distinctions in the Godhead?

*Yes*, saith T. D. *may this word Person be used by us, distinguishing the Father, Son and Spirit in the Godhead, and one from another.*

*Answer*, So it appears he pleads for a liberty to put improper names upon God from his pretence of analogy; the Scripture he mentions *Hebr. 1. 3.* makes against him, it being, *the express Image of his Substance, unchangeable*; but as it is in some English Copies, *express Image of his Person*; however, it is not *the express Person of his Person*, much less *the express singular Person, or rational Substance, subsisting by it self, distinct from the Father*; For I and my Father are one, said Christ, and the Son doth nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; and the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father; and if so be that the Soul separated from the Body cannot be called a Person, as T. D. saith, pag. 2, 3. how can he presume to call the Spirit, which is the Life or Breath of God a Person distinct from God, whilst God is never distinct and separate from his own Life? But then it appears that T. D. is necessitated to call the Glorious Divine three in Heaven something; and therefore he saith, *that distinction in the Godhead cannot be apprehended by us by any other name or resemblance, (then Person)* and saith he, *we know not what to*

call these three Persons, pag. 4. For the conception of a person that  
we have of the Father (say they) is a Subsistence or Person, is in some  
quatenus concepts in respect of the Divine Essence, &c. pag. 17.  
Reply, But by what doth he and his Brethren apprehend this con-  
ceiving God, surely, neither by the Scripture nor by immediate  
Revelation or Inspiration, nor yet by reason for that has failed  
them in this matter; Is also the nature and works of God is above  
their reach and the comprehension of the Creature; so that their  
conceptions and notions being unscriptural, we have no ground  
to believe them, whilst we have but their conceptions, words and  
notions for what they say derived from Popish and Heathen Au-  
thors, and not from any immediate Power, Revelation or Scrip-  
ture: and his saying, they do not know what to call these three, *the*  
*Persons*; shews, they were hard put to it, as being necessitated to call  
them something: but, what are they ignorant of the Scripture  
or would not the Scripture satisfy them, and yet profess it their  
Rule? they had better search the Scriptures instead of *Aquinas*  
and *Aristotle*, and see what they are called there; viz. *The Father*,  
*the Word*, and *Holy Ghost*, which are *One*; besides these three  
bearing record in Heaven, T. D. hath elsewhere called them *Wit-  
nesses*, pag. 3, 7, and 10. and thus he contradicts himself, one while  
he knows not what to call them, but Persons, and another while  
he calls them three *Witnesses*, || from their bearing  
Record; and thus in contradiction he knows  
what to call them besides Persons: but then he  
saith, all *Witnesses* (properly so called) are *Persons*. How proves he  
that? Are not all things that bear record *Witnesses*? Are Heaven  
and Earth *Persons*? and are the Water and the Blood *Persons*, see-  
ing they bear record in the Earth? and is Conscience in a man a  
Person distinct from the man, seeing Conscience beareth witness  
if it be, how then, is the Soul distinct from the Body a *Person*,  
page 11, 50.  
T. D. upon 1 John 5. 9. *The Witness of God is greater* referring  
to the *Witness* concerning Christ, verse 7. not to verse 8, for none of  
those *Witnesses* are God.  
Reply, And yet those *Witnesses* verse 8. are the Spirit, the Wa-  
ter, and the Blood: hereon T. D. hath denied the Spirit to be  
God contrary to their former pretence, and so is come under that  
they



be not simply? Was there ever such darkness and confusion uttered? and what blind Sophistry, and silly Logic and babling do these men use, and put upon the Immortal God? whom with all their inventions, airy notions and vain conceptions they can never reach the knowledge of; neither will, nor can their Heathenish

Page 10. Philosophy, terms of *Aristotle*, nor apostate Christians and Papists demonstrate or discover the Knowledge of either Father, Word, or Spirit to any people that want the knowledge thereof, but make them more dark and ignorant, and fling them up in more blindness, as they have a long time done.

And his saying, that *veritas* may by a metaphis, *you must be* *Veritas Person, or Subsistent, or some word to that effect*; and to tell that *John Martyr* applies *veritas* and *spiritus* to Father, Son and Spirit, pag. 17.

Now, Surely T. D. is put very hard to it to word his Doctrine by his *Analogy* and *Metaphis* for his distinctions of Person, and his thereby rendering *veritas* Person of necessity: Where proves he this, (and those terms by Scripture?) and if they signifie one and the same thing, why is not *spiritus* in *Hebr. 1.3.* and *Chap. 1.11.* as well as *veritas*? As in *Hebr. 11.1.* *Ratio* is the *Substance* of things hoped for; it is not *Person* of things hoped for; the same word that is for Substance in that, is *Hebr. chap. 1. verse 3.* where it is [speaking of the Son of God] *who being the brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Substance*: Besides, what ever Authors or Fathers, (so called) did put names, distinctions and names upon the Godhead which were either improper or unscriptural, we must follow the Scriptures, rather than them. And do they count all *John Martyr* wrote One hundred & fifty years after Christ to be of equal Authority with the Scriptures of Christ and the Apostles? Or must not (probably) *John* bring in some of his Philosophy, which is not Scripture? And we do not read in the Scriptures either of *three distinct Substances in God, or three distinct Persons*; for where are they so rendered either in the *Hebrew, Greek, Latin or English*, in Scripture from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Revelation? But if they be not three Substances, as *The Nicene* faith; how doth *2. Person* make *you are* and *you are* equivalent, or apply both to Father, Son and Spirit? Is not here a manifest contradiction between themselves, and their own Doctrine in this matter?

Now as for T. D. his Discourse about Satisfaction, there needs not much to be said unto it; for that the matter hath been answered before; and also in part he assents to W. P. in what he hath said; for he T. D. doth not affirm any impossibility of forgiveness without a plenary satisfaction made, (as in the sense and notion some of them have) Sec. 1. And though he acknowledgeth that by his satisfaction, P. D. affirmeth, you but cannot see with whom therein. He saith also, God is free in his determinations what distribute he will manifest, and in what degree and manner, and that between Justice and Mercy, and their effects, and all of his mercy will intervene. &c. By all which, in a great measure, he hath consented to what W. P. hath writ in this case, though in contradiction to his Brother Vines; as is evident.

But where he speaks of Vindictive Justice that God might only have manifested, when man fell, as he does upon the reprobate Angels & Devils, &c. Now I query then, Is this Vindictive Justice, that which Christ underwent at God's hand; (and satisfied according to their Doctrine?) if they say yes; where do the Scriptures say so? or that God inflicted the same revengefull Justice (as I think they mean) upon Christ, that he doth upon the reprobate Angels or Devils, and then make this the means and manner of full satisfaction for mankind? let us have plain Scripture for this Doctrine; was God's Love to man purchased by such revenge upon his innocent Son as he lays upon reprobate Angels or Devils? or is it not rather blasphemous to suppose that Christ should ever be so far out of Gods favour; as to construe his Sufferings to the height of revenge as goes against reprobate Angels and Devils? and doth not this also accord with T. V. his Doctrine? whereas Christ was the beloved of the Father, even his only begotten, the Son of his love, in whom his Soul delighted; and was always well pleased, both in his works and Sufferings; both in his life and death for Sinners; but angry with the wicked, such as persecuted him and crucified him afresh unto themselves, as he was also crucified in Spiritual Sodom and Egypt; such Adversaries God will be avenged of; but his pleasure shall prosper in the hand of his Anointed Seed Christ; but these things T. D. his weak judgement (as he confesseth it to be, pag. 18.) cannot reach. — And indeed in much of his Discourse about this matter, he has talked more like a Lawyer,

then a Divine; and has brought several Objections which will not hold in matters of such high concernment. But I shall not need much to take notice of his dark kind of reasoning in this particular, which proceeds but from his weak judgment and private conceptions, since the matter is answered elsewhere, and the extent of his and their Principles therein is farther manifest, and handled about his (and their) Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness, and his Arguments for Sin and Imperfection in all terms of life: yet a little to some particulars I may observe by the way (of this point) after he saith, *he shall give in his senses, confessing that Satisfaction is not a Scriptural phrase*, pag. 19. However, we will chuse Scripture phrase rather than T. D.'s weak judgment and conceptions therein, having plenty of Scripture Phrases for *pardon, forgiveness, remissions*, (upon a true Repentance.) And I query what Scripture he hath for his explanation of Satisfaction; viz. *a compensation made to God for our sin by Christ doing or suffering, or both, Justice that is vindictive?* pag. 19. What Scripture hath he for these words and this Doctrine? Is not this a confirmation to what is queried before concerning this he calls *Vindictive Justice*? the same that God punisheth the reprobate Angels or Devils with, the same he reckons Christ to have suffered; and so hath numbered Christ among reprobate Angels and Devils; but yet another while Christ's being under the Law, Gal. 4. 4, 5. T. D. construes, *as was lying barely in the smarts of sinners; but in the brand of infamy thereby set upon us*, pag. 20. But then how was it the same revenge or punishment that reprobate Angels and Devils undergo, and Sinners deserved, which surely is more then the brand of infamy? is not here manifest contradiction? and did the brand of infamy proceed as revengefull Justice from God; or rather from the envy and injustice of the wicked against him.

Again, he was not ashamed to call us Brethren, *Heb. 2. 11.* that is (saith T. D.) *Fellow Subjects, for being one in nature with us; he becomes one with us in an obligation to the same Law; to which I say, if we are fellow Subjects, and one in nature with Christ, and he one with us in obligation, &c. and that the brand of infamy he underwent be set upon us; then it is to be minded, first that soch as be Christ's Brethren one in nature, and fellow Subjects with him are Sanctified, and not remaining in a polluted nature, nor yet in a sinful imperfect state all their life time; seeing both he that sancti-*  
fies,



flesh; and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them Brethren, *Heb. 2. 11.*

Secondly, Fellow-Subjects with Christ that are bound with him, and partake of his Sufferings; are not rebellious, nor disobedient to him or his Law, but faithfull followers of him, by whose Power, Aid and Assistance they are encouraged in their obedience and faithfulness to him; and this is the effect both of Christ's Manifestation, Obedience and Righteousness to and in every one that believes.

Thirdly, If Christ's condescension and union with his Followers, and their being Fellow-Subjects with him be the thing that Christ tendereth to God for Satisfaction, as T. D. in his Answer intimates, then, if he had held to this we should not much have differed; but how this agrees with their Doctrine for the continuance of Impiety and Sin in all, (covered over with a pretence of full satisfaction being made for them, which still leaves all in sin) I do not yet understand, nor doth it appear how he and his Brethren can be reconciled herein.

But whereas T. D. confesseth that Christ bore by *doing and suffering* his satisfaction, and that the satisfaction may be made as well *Abroad as Within*; therein hath he contradicted many of his Brethren, who lay it upon his Suffering and Death only; another while upon his under-going *Vindictive Justice*, as they call it, the same that is laid upon Devils.

But then, if his Satisfaction be as well *abroad as within*, whether or no he did do all in the dayes of his Flesh, in his own person, that was to be done for man? or whether his work is not experimentally to be known and wrought in every man, for the destruction or ending of Sin and Transgression, before full satisfaction and peace be enjoyed with God? seeing his coming in the likeness of sinfull flesh, was to Condemn sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; and is not this Law Spiritual which we are bound to obey? for can it be supposed that all mankind (or the Nation of the *Gentiles*) were bound under the Law that was given to the Jews outwardly. And then would it be good Doctrine to say, that we, or all Nations, were Fellow-Subjects with Christ bound under the Law of the Jews, which had the Shadows of good things to

come? or is it not more meet so, that all ought to be subject unto the Law of Christ, the Law of Faith, the Law of the Spirit of Life in him; and that he was made a curse *(Heb. 7. 22.)* therein of a better Testament, which is spiritual, and the Righteousness of the Law which he fulfils within, is also spiritual and inwardly known; its judgment, sentence and condemnation known inwardly, wherein he is condemned in the flesh; seeing that the Commandment that was ordained to Life the Apostle found to be unto death in him, as it is in all that come to Life; and is not this the effect of Christ's Coming, Obedience, Sufferings, &c. : and how can these things be experienced but by waiting in his Light and Spirit within? and if Satisfaction consists as well *Agree* as *Pacify* are not Christ's inward and spiritual operations included in his going out to work for others? Solution? how then can man exclude them, and think himself wholly acquitted, and yet in his sin, by the Suffering and Death of Christ without, in a full compensation and satisfaction in his stead? And for whom was Christ a Propitiation, for the appeasement of wrath, relaxation of the Law, purchase of freedom from punishment, &c. : If it consist in his Personal Obedience and Satisfaction only, without the knowledge of his work within? then are not all men to live and be acquitted for whom he did suffer? and doth not this extend to all that were dead? for he is a propitiation for the Sins of the whole world, but this *Presbyterian* deny; || what effect then do they put upon Christ's Sufferings? viz. that he suffered any one, then with others for a small select number, (according to their Doctrine) whereas his Suffering was for all men, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, (who were dead in sin) in regard of his confirmation of that Spiritual and Living Dispensation and Testament which extends both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, which was promised to *Abraham*, which is to be believed and obeyed. But to T. D.'s matter (for these things are out of the reach of his carnal conceptions) what during? what during? what during?

As concerning the *precious Blood*, which he confesseth to be the Price that hath made a *Paradise*, 1 Pet. 18. 19. I ask, if the effects of that Blood are not known within, in its purging the Conscience, and cleansing from all unrighteousness, &c. : And seeing he confesseth it to be the Blood of God, pag. 26. What Scripture hath he here to call it *human*?

*humane?* and doth the Satisfaction consist in humane Blood? how then doth it satisfy infinite Justice? Is not humane Finite, according to T. D. and T. V. their Doctrine? But if this Blood of God, which was shed for all men, have an inward effect in the Conscience, in order to the answering of Gods will, and his pure Law within, and thereby being to his satisfaction; how can men continuing in their sins, truly plead they are fully acquitted at once without them, and they only in the implicate belief thereof, received from the ridged *Presbytery*, rest satisfied in their sins all their lifetime?

And where doth T. D. prove his Doctrine of *Christ's being holy by a true inherent righteousness of the humane Nature?* pag. 25. what Scripture hath he for this, or these Expressions? was not his Righteousness from the Divine Nature? and was it not everlasting? but is not that which is humane Finite?

And T. D. saying, that *the Socinians vomit, the Quakers have now licked up* || pag. 27. herein hath he spoken scornfully and falsely against us, which will not at all tend to convince Socinians, if they were as bad as rendered, but to that they can answer him. || *Here T. D. hath put as as in the Devil's Box as formerly he confessed he did*

And his saying, *the Elect, whilst Sinners in State*: where proves he this, that the Elect are Sinners in State, seeing the State of the Elect is a sanctified and chosen State out of the World, and its ways, chosen in Christ through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the Truth, 1 *Thes.* 2. 13. the impossibility of deceiving the Elect is signified *Math.* 24. 24. where the Calling and Election is made sure, they shall never fall, 1 *Per.* 1. 10.

And that Christ was made surety of a better Covenant, *Heb.* 7. 22. And came to do his Fathers Will, *Heb.* 10. 7. And that his being a Surety is an Act of Grace, pag. 28. This we confess and own more then you that contend for Sin, for the Will of God is our Sanctification, and the better Testament and Covenant which Christ is the Surety, Mediator and Establisher of, is that of Righteousness, Life and Peace, wherein Sins and Transgressions are done away, and wherein true Believers live to God.

And as for T. D. his so often comparing God to a Creditor, Christ to the Surety, and Sinners as the Debtors; telling of God as

ing considered as a Creditor, and as a private Person, pag. 32. But where doth the Scripture so call him.

*Reply.* He does not speak from a true sense of God or Christ, or of Gods Covenant, but a Notion he hath learned by Tradition; and as to Sinners, their case is worse then merely Debtors; they not onely owing obedience to God and Christ, but are disobedient and rebellious, as the case of Fellons, Traytors and other Malefactors is worse then that of Debtors; yet Christ is our Surety, Mediator and Intercessor, to make agreement between God and man, and to deliver man from the Punishment and Wrath to come, [by delivering from Sin, the cause of it, and destroying the Devil the Author of Sin;] not for us still to live in Sin, and daily both contract more Debt, and incur tribulation and anguish upon our Souls: Howbeit, the Wayes of God extend beyond T. D's comparifon; his Wayes are not as man wayes, nor his Thoughts as mans thoughts: for as the Heaven is higher then the Earth, so are my Thoughts higher then your thoughts saith the Lord, whose graciousness also to poor deceived lost man, for his restoration, is infinitely beyond mans legality and exactions; as the Lord said, I will not execute the fierceness of mine Anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim; for I am God and not man, the Holy One in the midst of thee, Hosea 11. 9.

But is there not perfect obedience now for men to perform? must they all live in Sin and Imperfection tearm of life, and say all our Debts is paid? and if all their Debts be paid, why are they not out of Prison? *||* Are not all that are in Sin and Bondage of Corruption in Prison? and would it be glad Tydings to tell them that though Christ has paid all their Debts, and procured their release, and ransomed them, that they must not expect personal freedom out of Prison, nor out of their Chains and Fetters so long as they lived here? or if one should tell the Slaves in Turkey that they are ransomed, and yet they must not expect personal freedom from their Vassalry and Slavery so long

*|| But man in the fallen state is worse then merely a Debtor; for he is a Malefactor, guilty of high Offences and Crimes against the pure Law of God, for which he must feel Justice in the Administration of the Law and Sentence of death inwardly upon the Transgressor, before he receive and enjoy the mercies, ransom and peace with God.*

as they live here, would this be glad tidings? no sure, but rather sad news, and is just like these *Presbyterians* and *Independents* preaching to people, and the tendence of their Gospel, and pretence of Satisfaction, Redemption, Ransom, &c. whilst they hold none of them in Truth nor Righteousness, nor in the same Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures of Truth, and Testimonies of Christ or his Apostles.

*T. D. pag. 28. He is satisfied, and the debt paid too, by his Intercession, which being grounded upon his Satisfaction, supposes it to be what it pretends, full and complete.*

*Obser.* Here it is to be observed, that notwithstanding this his Assertion of the Satisfaction [both by payment and punishment] being completely made, and the debt fully paid; yet he confesseth to Christ's Intercession: but what does he ever live to make Intercession for, if all be fully done, paid, satisfied at once by Christ's personal subjection and obedience;

|| must there ever be an intercession for that which is already so fully and dearly paid for, (as they reckon Christ hath done) and God hath granted? how will this hold consistent? But then it appears, *it supposes it to be what it pretends full and complete*, saith T. D. pag. 30. So here is now supposition and pretence put upon Christ's Intercession and Satisfaction; what sorry shallow work is this; but it appears. But to proceed from one that hath followed his own conceptions, notions, weak judgement and humane understanding; as also

|| *Though God was always well pleased and satisfied in Christ, in his doing and Suffering, and as he was a Sacrifice for Sin; yet this is not enough for us to profess and believe, without knowing the Work of Christ, and Effect of his Sufferings and Righteousness within, and his Spirit to make intercession, &c. Rom. 8. Phil. 3. 9. 10.*

one that by his Logick and Traditional borrowed Notions and Doctrines goes about to make People to believe that from him, that he hath no Scripture phrase for, as that of God being a private person, and other things. And therefore like a Lawyer is fain to patch up his work as well as he can, though in many things it be very inconsistent and repugnant to it self.

And whereas our confessing Christ both in Life and Suffering to be a perfect and real Example, is so much struck at by these Priests and

and Professors; (we still without confessing both to his Power and Living Effects through all) and of all his Sufferings, Afflictions, Death and Life, which we reverently esteem; touching which I testify, in the Lord, that if Christ be not really owned and confessed, as he was a real Example, both in Life, Conversation, and in Patient Suffering; neither the Fellowship of his Suffering, nor the Power thereof, is truly known or experienced; for they who would partake of the Benefit and blessed Effects of Christ's Death and Sufferings, and yet will not own him for their Example, shall never enjoy him therein; seeing that Christ also hath suffered for us, leaving us an Example, that we should follow his steps, who did not sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, 1 Pet. 2. 21, 22. and

Again, Forasmuch then as Christ hath Suffered for us in the Flesh, arm your selves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the Flesh hath ceased from sin, that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the Flesh to the lusts of men, but to the Will of God, Chap. 4. 1, 2.

Now the ceasing from Sin, and following of Christ's steps in the harmless sinless state, is the right use and end of his Suffering for man, and his Example to man. But then mark T. D's Doctrine as followeth, what an example and subject of Wrath and Vindictive Justice (so termed) he renders Christ, viz.

T. D. pag. 36. 4. *Christ when he suffered was not innocent, and when God required satisfaction of him, it was due from him; Christ was guilty of our sin, when he suffered for it; for guilt is but obligatio ad poenam, an obligation to undergo punishment, which Christ was under by contract, Heb. 7. 22.*

*Ans.* Its no wonder that these Presbyterians, and those of their affinity accuse all Christ's Followers of being Sinners, and imperfect all their life time, since that T. D. (one of their Leaders or Chieftains) hath accused Christ not to be innocent when he suffered; saying also, Christ was guilty of our Sin when he suffered for it, which how false and blasphemous this charge is against Christ, I appeal to all sober and moderate Professors of Christianity, who have any real esteem and reverence to the Name of Christ and his Glory, and how contrary to plain Scripture-testimonies plentifully given of him, as being a Lamb, yea, the Lamb of God, which declared his innocency and purity, being without sin or guile, who offered up himself



himself by the Eternal Spirit, a Lamb without spot to God, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. *chap.* 2. 22. *Hebr.* 9. 14. *Isa.* 53. 7. *Acts* 8. 32. Now his being a Lamb without spot, and without blemish, manifests him to be a perfect Offering, and Sacrifice for Sin; as also how guilt is more then barely an obligation to under-go punishment, being always imputed to the Transgressors and disobedient for sin, and not to Christ, *Rom.* 9. 19. *1<sup>st</sup> Jam.* 2. 10. *1 Cor.* 11. 27. *Deut.* 19. 13. and 21. 9. *Exod.* 34. 7.

Although tis true those chief Priests, false Witnesses, and Persecutors of Christ among the *Jews*, and such as accused him for a Blasphemer, they said also that he was guilty of death, *Mat.* 26. 61, 66. *Mark* 14. 64. whose example *T. D.* hath followed in accusing Christ of being guilty, and not innocent. But if *T. D.* should say he meant not that Christ was really, or inherently, or personally guilty of sin, but by imputation, and so not innocent, but guilty of our sins; by this we may perceive then what he means by imputation; that on the one hand an innocent person is made guilty, and is not innocent whilst he hath no sin, nor guile or evil in him: and so on the other hand, by their own rule of contraries (*contraria contrarium ratio*) persons are to be reckoned imputatively righteous and innocent in God's sight, whilst there is neither righteousness nor innocency really in them, which is both unreasonable, unscriptural, and apparently false. It was a false imputation of the persecuting *Jews* and *Tho. Danson* to impute guilt of sin to Christ, and to accuse him with not being innocent, when no sin, evil, nor guilt was in him; and it is as false an imputation of theirs to impute Christ's Righteousness to sinfull persons, who are not in it, nor partakes of it, in them; so its neither God's imputation nor Christ's; for had *Abraham* no righteousness really in him, when his Faith was reckoned to him for righteousness? where then was his Faith, and the righteousness and obedience of it, if in reality he was not a partaker and an enjoyer thereof within? from whence did his acts or works of real obedience proceed and flow, if not from his living Faith, and its righteousness within? Surely they are of very mean capacities that cannot see *T. D.*'s absurdities and ignorance in these matters; And his vain imaginations and conceits about imputation further will appear, and that the stress and drift of his sermon and his Brethrens work in these invented Doctrines is to keep people

in their sins and imperfections all their dayes, and so their work in rendring Christ the subject of guilt, and so of vengeance that belongs to Devils, and their rendring people the subjects of his Righteousness and Justification by imputation, whilst unjust and sinful in themselves; it all centers in their sinfull Doctrine for sin and imperfection term of life.

Pag. 37. As to T. D's telling of the Son of God's Incarnation, *the creation of his Body and Soul, the parts of that nature he subsisted in, &c.*

To this I say, if the Body and Soul of the Son of God were both Created, doth not this render him a Fourth Person? for Creation was in time, which contradicts their Doctrine of Three *distinct Incarnated, Co-eternal, Co-essential Persons in the Deity*; seeing that which was created was not so: but herein whether doth not his and their ignorance of the only begotten of the Father, and their denial of Christs Divinity plainly appear yea or nay? where doth the Scripture say that his Soul was created? for was not he the brightness of his Fathers Glory, and the express Image of his Divine Substance? But supposing the Soul of Christ was (with the Body) created in time; I ask, if from Eternity he was a Person distinct from God and his holy Spirit, without either Soul or Body? and where doth the Scripture speak of any Person without either Soul or Body? lets have plain Scripture.

Pag. 38. Whilst T. D. grants *our actual freedom from sin and wrath depends on what Christ did and suffered, as on and upon its means*; what becomes of his Doctrine and Pleas for sin and imperfection which they that continues in term of life cannot be truly said to be Actually freed from sin, nor yet imputatively righteous in Gods sight, whilst actually and really sinfull: And if Christs obedience was not intended to exempt us from a personal obedience to the Law, as is confest in pag. 38. then its contrary to the end of his Obedience to live in sin and disobedience term of life, and for any to be reckoned imputatively righteous, when actually disobedient.

Secondly, And if we be only *so far made righteous by Christs Obedience, as unrighteous by our own disobedience*: how far is that? have we not been actually unrighteous, and shall we so far be made righteous by Christs Righteousness? Is not this more then your Doctrine  
of

of Imputation (whilst personally sinfull) amount to ; but your flat contradictions in these matters are evident.

Page. 39. And though Christ is our Surety, this doth not exempt us either from following him, or walking in the Way of God ; but the more ingage us therein ; and herein we know acceptance in the Beloved of God, in that holy conversation which his pure Law within enjoyns, without obedience to which God is not well pleased, nor satisfied on man's part, though he was even well pleased and satisfied in his own Son, both in his doing and suffering ; the benefit whereof they only receive who believe in, and obey him in his Light within : and to such only he is the Author of Eternal Salvation, as do obey him ; though the free proffers of Gods Love in him towards all mankind, God commended his Love to us, in that whilst we were Sinners Christ died.

So that we do faithfully acknowledge the Love and Goodness of God in Christ, and would not at all have it diminished or suspected, nor yet have Christ's Offices, Works, or end of his coming brought into question ; however we do oppose mens confusions and misapprehensions concerning God, Christ's Righteousness, Faith, &c. which none rightly know, or apprehend, but they who are led by the Spirit of God.

And now touching Justification by Imputed Righteousness, where it is known in reallity, *Of Justification.* we never denied or opposed, seeing that where God imputes or reckons righteousness as he did to *Abraham*, and still doth to his Seed of Faith, that hath a real sence and enjoyment of it, as every one hath, that is in the exercise of the true and living Faith : But we do still oppose and deny the vain Conceits and Imaginations of the *Presbyterians, Independents*, and all of their affinity touching their false Imputation and Justification to sinful and wicked men, (whilst such) which be that justifieth is abomination to the Lord, as he is that condemneth the Just.

Page. 39. But whilst T. D. grants that the word *Justifico* and *δικαίωσις*, and the Hebrew *Hitzdik* *To Justifie,* signifies *Justum facere* : By this he hath contradicted *what is in.* himself, and much of his Brethrens work ; for Persons being justified whilst the Subjects of Sin and disobedience ; for if *to Justifie be*

to make *Just*, then tis a real work effected by the Spirit of God, Sanctification and Justification being inseparable Companions, as *T. Vincent* hath confessed, which is not their imagined Justification, nor pronouncing men righteous whilst they are really unrighteous; for whilst such the Spirit of God doth both condemn and accuse, and not justifie them in any thing contrary to its own nature; neither is it truly said that men are made *Just* while they continue unjust and Sinners.

Secondly, if the word *Impute* *λογίζαναι* properly signifie to cast account; and the Hebrew *Chasbab* signifies to think, imagine, and reason, &c. as *T. D.* saith.

Then first, if it hath relation to Gods imputing righteousness to the Believer, the account he casts therein must needs be true; for he doth not account wicked men righteous.

Secondly, If *Impute* signifieth to think, imagine and reason: as to imagining, it cannot have relation to God, for his Account is beyond Imaginations, and his thoughts above mans thoughts; and then it is not safe nor true in man to depend upon his own thinking, or imagining, or imputation; for where God accounts a man righteous, his Spirit doth evidence it beyond thoughts or imaginations; for many imagine and think *themselves* righteous, when they are unrighteous; as there is a Generation that is pure in their own eyes, yet are not cleansed from their filthiness: and when Christ's Righteousness is esteemed any ones, it is not without the works of his own, as it is falsely asserted pag. 39. no more then *Abraham's* Faith was without its own works or obedience.

Pag. 40. *T. D.* Argues first from the proportion which our justification by Christ's Righteousness bears to our condemnation by Adam's sin; but our condemnation was by imputation of Adam's sin; therefore our Justification is by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness *Rom. 5. 19.*

Reply, This Condemnation that is come upon all men, is because all have sinned and partaken of the fall, being in *Adam* in the Earthly state, really bearing his Image, and this is not a thinking or imagining a condemnation from, or for an imputation of *Adam's* sin, (according to their notion of it) but really a partaking of the disodience of one upon all; every man shall die for his own iniquity, the Soul that sinneth, it shall die, &c.

And

And if our Justification by Christ's Righteousness bears a proportion to our Condemnation, then must we as really partake of Christ's Righteousness, being converted, as we have of sin being unconverted; and this is not a thinking or imagining our selves righteous, but a true enjoyment and bearing his Image, and being conformable to it, as really as we have born and been conformable to the Image of the Earthly, 1 Cor. 15. 47. 48. 49.

T. D. Argues secondly, from the proportion of *our being made righteous bears to Christ being made sin*; but Christ was made sin by imputation; therefore so are we made righteous, 2 Cor. 5. ult. for he was made sin for us, who knew no sin (i. e. by an experimental knowledge of its operation in himself he did no sin, 1 Pet. 2. 21.) that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Reply, Here T. D. hath but brought over his old Arguments long since answered and confuted by that Servant of the Lord S. Fisher, as may be seen at large in his Book *Rustic and Academic*; which T. D. J. O. and their Brethren could never answer; this I mention, that people may perceive his matter to be neither new, nor more profound then it was many years ago, when it was confuted by Truth: And if our being made the Righteousness of Christ bears a proportion to his being made to be sin for us, when he knew no sin by its operation in himself, nor did sin; then it follows by this proportion that we are made (or rather thought or imagined) to be the Righteousness of God in Christ, whilst we neither knew his Righteousness, nor experienced his work in our selves, nor did righteousness; which is altogether false, and contrary to the Apostles Doctrine and intent, seeing that it is Christ in whom is no sin, that we are made Gods Righteousness, having experienced the new Creatures state in Christ, which in him is created unto good works, which God hath ordained we should walk in them, 2 Cor. 5. 17. 18. Ephes. 2. 10. and this is more then thoughts or imaginations of being righteous, or in Christ; for it is in truth and reality, which admits not of your imagined applications, or claiming an interest in that which you are out of, and which is none of yours in the true enjoyment.

And if the word *Impure*, hath relation to Justification and *Justifie*, signifie *Justum facere*, then W. P's definition thereof is true, being that which expresseth what is personally enjoyed, and not imagined,

and this was no Cavil, as *The. Dawson* falsely saith page 41.

*T. D. God admits of what Christ did on our behalf, as if it were our Personal Act,* pag. 41.

*Reply,* This is his apprehension of the Sureties payment of the Debt, as appears before, which is a very easie put off, to evade personal, or real and perfect obedience on the Creatures part; but it will not be so accepted of God, as the end of Christ's Obedience; seeing that it was to make man righteous, as his condemning Sin in the Flesh was, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us that walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit; which righteousness fulfilled in us *T. D.* formerly said was to be meant in Christ's Person, and not in ours, by which likewise he hath both excluded man from the real enjoyment of Christ and his Righteousness, and from that obedience and sanctity which he requires, and answers the end of his coming and manifestation; and by this means the Professors have made the Law and Commands and Teachings of God ineffectual as to the Creature, whilst Christ only is made the subject of them, and not man; and this gives a liberty to people to live in sin all their time, and to pervert Gods Laws, and neglect the teachings of his Grace, and vainly to excuse themselves in their disobedience, like as *T. D.* hath done; as where the Grace of God and his pure Law requires perfect obedience from us, and that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, and that we should live godly, righteously and soberly in this present world; now if any man should say, that this was not intended to us, but to Christ, as if God did require him to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, to forsake all sin, and live righteously, when he never did nor could sin, nor had the Prince of the world any thing in him; this would be a strange put off, and gross perversion of the Law of God, to lay it all upon Christ, and put it from themselves: whereas Christ's Example is perfectly to be followed, and where he is manifest, and his Life brought forth in man, there is a conformity to his Heavenly Image, and not a living in sin, nor to the lusts of the world, but to the Will of God.

Pag. 42. But as to *T. D.*'s confessing to the Creditors cancelling the Bond, letting the Debtor out of Prison, giving a legal Discharge upon the Sureties payment of the Debt, as he could have done upon his personal payment.

First.



First, Hereupon I do enquire, if man that hath been in Prison and bondage under sin and corruption be let out of that Prison upon Christ's Obedience? if he be, then he must not remain in personal bondage all his life time, from partaking of Christ's Righteousness and Obedience; for if he be released from the servitude of sin, and be let out of that bondage, then he is made free from it by the Law of the Spirit of Life, to serve, obey and walk in the Law of Righteousness by Faith; and this is not an imagined fiction or conceit of Freedom or Justification, whilst people are in real bondage, which your Doctrine tends to keep people in.

Though it be true, as amongst men, that the Act of one Person may by contract, or Act of Law become the Act of another, as the Sureties payment of the Debt is accepted for the Debtor; yet in this case it doth not reach the real and full intent of Christ's Coming, Obedience and Righteousness, which is to bring man into his Image, and to fulfil the righteousness of the Law in man, that he may follow his Steps, and have the same Mind, Spirit and Righteousness in him that was in Christ, that he may walk after his Example in all purity and holiness of conversation.

Yet so far as releasement out of Prison is imported in the comparison, or any thing tending to a real Deliverance of the Creature out of Sin and Corruption, and so from Condemnation, it may be admitted of so; for then it contradicts their pleading for sin and imperfection term of life: and surely God doth not legally declare any to be righteous, whilst his Spirit and Law within reproves them for sin, and declares them unrighteous; for God and his Spirit do not contradict one another; neither doth God declare people to be out of Prison, whilst they are really in bondage to their sins, lusts and vanities, as the carnal Priests and Professors have falsely done; but the Liberty which Christ proclaims to the Captives is really to be enjoyed and received by every one that believes, and receives him, his Message and Testimony.

And this is not a false Imputation, or an imagined Application of Righteousness and Freedom to People in their personal bondage of Sin and Corruption, such as T. D. and such false Guides have led people into.

And that of *Ezek. 18. 20.* the Son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father, T.D. saith, *Imports Gods gracious recesson from his right,*  
*be-*

because of their more than ordinary Audacity in charging his Ways with inequality: This is his false construction;

For God sheweth his Way to be equal *v. 25, 26, 27.* which is no recession from his right, as his condemning such as turn from righteousness, and Justifying and giving Life to such as turn from wickedness; for both Graciousness, Mercy, and Judgement are his right, and he rewardeth every man in Righteousness according to the Equality of his Ways.

T. D. Nor doth God Justifie what is opposite to his pure Nature in Justifying a person who in himself is impure upon the righteousness of another imputed to him.

Reply, Is not a person that is in himself impure opposite to God's pure Nature? Surely purity and impurity are opposite; and whilst the impure Person is rendered the subject of Justification upon another's righteousness imputed, he then it seems is accounted pure by T. D. and not opposite to God's pure Nature, though he be personally impure; but surely God doth not then account him pure, whilst in impurity; for God cannot lye, nor account as the Wicked and Hypocrites do, who are pure in their own eyes, though not washed from their filchiness; and here we may see T. D. and his Brethrens false notion and conception of *Imputation* and *Justification*, and how contrary it is to *Justum facere*, which the word *Justifie* signifieth, as by him before confest, (*viz. to make Just*) when now he falsely renders an impure person not opposite to the pure Nature of God, from his notion of *Imputation* and *Justification* in that state.

Pag. 44. Arg. 3. Sin came not by Imputation, but by actual Transgression, [This is laid down as the *Quakers*.]

To which T. D. Answers, *The sin of Adam was made his Posterities by Imputation; Rom. 5. 12, 14. Adam was a common Root of Mankind by nature.*

Reply, Herein hath he perverted the Scripture, which doth not say that the Sin of Adam was made his Posterities by Imputation; neither doth he hereby prove his notion of Imputation of Righteousness to impure persons; for sure he cannot prove that all Adam's Posterity were pure, and sin not actually theirs, but only imputed to them whilst not partakers of it; this is contradictory; and as false as their Imputation of Righteousness and justification to men whilst

whilst unjust; but the Scripture he mentions Rom. v. 12. saith, As by one man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin, to Death past upon all men, for that all have sinned; (mark that) for until the Law Sin was in the World, but Sin is not imputed where there is no Law, verse 13. But now (mark) there is a Law transgressed, whereby Sin and Transgression is imputed to them that are guilty in transgression, as all men, in the earthly state and nature are; and therefore on the other hand righteousness is not imputed to persons through Christ; or to such that are not partakers of his righteousness.

Page. 45. Arg. 4. *Quæstion.* A man cannot be said to be actually sinful, and imputatively righteous; he may as well be said to be actually damned, and imputatively saved.

*To which T. D. answereth, Why not? as well as to say, a man is actually poor and not worth a farthing, but imputatively rich, as having by Surety paid his debt of thousands.*

*Reply.* Here he hath plainly discovered their notion of Imputation, and the falseness of it, (viz.) that a man is imputatively righteous when actually sinful, or actually damned and yet imputatively saved: what gross Corruption and Ignorance is this? and what an improper Comparison doth he bring to back it (let the wise judge) and we do not admit of it in this case; as that a man should be actually damned and imputatively saved, or actually guilty and yet imputatively innocent, but that such to whom righteousness and true riches are reckoned as being theirs, have right therein and are partakers thereof; and what he asserts herein by his simile is but a begging the question, and taking that for granted which is still opposed as both unscriptural and unreasonable; viz. men being actually damned and imputatively saved, or actually guilty and imputatively innocent; by the same reason he might as well say, persons really Thieves are innocent, or persons really and actual treacherous and rebellious are true and good Subjects; or actually Devils and imputatively Saints: But Christ being or becoming our Surety was not to impute righteousness to men in transgression, but to bring them into Covenant and Peace with God, which stands in everlasting righteousness, and not in sin; for he was also a perfect example to be followed as well as professed; and he is the Surety of the new Testament and Covenant which is spiritual, and is manifested and

enjoyed in his people. And T. D. instance [that as in many things  
our Antecedent Acts are actually guilty, and yet imputatively innocent;  
when the same man is admitted to sustain the punishment due to the  
rest] is as foolish and impertinent as the rest before; for neither is  
a mutinous Army innocent, nor is Christ any of the mutinous or  
guilty Persons.

And where proves T. D. that Imputation is an Act of Law and makes  
a Relation, and not a real change? I ask what Law it is an Act of?  
is it real or true, or no? if it be of God it must be true; if not,  
then false; and it is a false imputation which is not real, and con-  
trary to the Apostles Doctrine, who knew that Abraham's Faith was  
imputed or reckoned to him for righteousness, and to that state to  
which there was no condemnation (but justification) which was a  
state of being & walking in Christ, and not a walking after the Flesh,  
but after the Spirit; and this they that experience and witness,  
know a real change from death to life, from condemnation to justi-  
fication, from sin to righteousness, from the wayes of death and  
darkness to the wayes of Life, Light and Peace.

Page 45. T. D. saith, There is no need of inherent Righteousness for  
Justification, but yet there is need of it for other ends, as to make us  
meet for Heaven, Col. 1. 12.

Ans. It appears that he means by this inherent righteousness  
that of Sanctification, (or the work of Gods Spirit within) which  
hereafterwards calls personal righteousness; and is there no need of  
this for Justification? what darkness is there? as if men were justi-  
fied whilst in the unsanctified state; this is like the rest of his foolish  
stuff, quite contrary to the Apostles Doctrine, which is, But ye are  
Sanctified, but ye are Justified in the Name of our Lord Jesus  
Christ, and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. 6. 11. And also what  
contradiction hath T. D. brought to himself herein, whilst he hath  
confessed, that the word Justifie signifieth to make just; as also he  
hath confessed that inherent Righteousness, as he call it, gives a fit-  
ness of enjoying the Heavenly Inheritance, is lying in Communion with  
God, pag. 46. then it follows, that it gives a fitness for Justification,  
whilst Justification and Sanctification are inseparable Companions;  
and God loves his Image in his People freely, saith his Brother T. V.  
Thus without Washing, Cleansing and Sanctification men are not  
Justified, seeing the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of  
God,

God, and they that live in unrighteousness cannot be accepted of him; It being not the Hearers of the Law, but the Doers that shall be *Justified*.

Page. 46. And now concerning *good works* that are acceptable to God, which T. D. accuseth us with placing *Merit* for Justification, or as a deserved cause thereof, &c.

Concerning this particular, that faithfull Servant of the Lord *S. Fisher* hath very fully answered T. D. and his Brethren; and it hath been manifest how he did wrong and abuse *S. Fisher* about this point; and how contrary to his intent he construed *good works*, as being ours, relating to self works, or *imperfect obedience*, which *S. Fisher* never intended, but with Relation to those works which are perfect, which Christ is the Author of, (which if Christs Works be not deserving, whose are they) and to those which God hath wrought in us, who having ordained Peace for us, hath wrought all our works in us, *Isa. 26.* now we never placed a merit upon self-acting, nor upon mans best works in the faine, sinfull and corrupt state; so that there is not a correspondency betwixt us and the Papists in this particular, as falsely we have been accused; see *S. Fisher's Rusticum ad Academicos*, where the point is fully explained, which you *Presbyterians* and *Independents* are never able to answer.

Where did we ever profess or hold forth, that we were able, or could fulfil the Law our selves, or merit or deserve Salvation by any thing that we could do? but we do profess and witness, that through the Power of Christ we are enabled to faithfull and sincere obedience, not of our selves, knowing, that good works (how ever rejected and undervalued) are ordained of God, and without them your faith is dead, as a body without a Spirit is.

And it is true enough, as T. D. saith, *That you are averse to obedience through corruptions*; who plead for sin term of life, and yet would cover over all your filthy raggs with a pretence of Christs Righteousness, Satisfaction, Imputation, Justification and Merit, whilst you are yet in your sins and corruptions, and in the weakness of your flesh, but as under the Law of works) wherein you are in no perfect obedience.

Page. 47. Seeing the Law of Faith is acknowledged, I ask, how far it extends, whether to enjoin to the perfect obedience of Faith,

yea or nay? seeing sin and corruption is so prevalent amongst you, and so contended for, surely where the exercise of the true and living Faith is experienced, there is obedience to the Law of it; or else what doth it signifie whilst persons remain in disobedience?

Further, T. D. confesseth, *that we have an immediate dependancy upon God in our operations, John 15. 3. without me ye can do nothing, (Siorfima me) separate or apart from me.*

It is well he hath at some time assented to the Truth, but how doth this contradict the greatest part of his own and his Brethrens work elsewhere, in their pleading for imperfect obedience, and their imagined imputation of Righteousness and Justification to the unrighteous and unjust? for those operations which have a relation to an immediate dependence upon God, which he that is in Christ doth experience and bring forth, do accord with the mind and will of God, which is the Sanctification of those that believe, and with that most holy Faith which purifies the heart; and these are not imperfect, nor to be slighted as undeserving, according to the vain notions of Priests concerning Faith, its works and inherent Righteousness, as they term it.

Page 47. T. D. *Their dependancy upon Christ in all the good they do, is as near and intimate, as the Branches upon the Vine by vertue of their natural union in bearing Fruit.*

*Ans.* This is also a Truth that grants a perfect obedience in them that have such a near intimate dependancy upon Christ, as the Branch hath that grows upon the Vine, by vertue of the natural Union thereof; this also contradicts their pleading for imperfection and sin in all obedience and works, which also shews that they do not flow nor spring from Christ the true Vine, as also, that they have not union with him, nor are Branches of him; and indeed how they have not immediate dependancy upon God in Christ whilst they deny Immediate Teaching, Revelation and Divine Inspiration to be attainable in these dayes.

But seeing without, or apart, or separate from Christ men can do nothing; how then can they be any thing without him, as righteous, or acceptable, or justified? For men must be something in that Relation before they can do any thing acceptable; and it is the Spirit and Power of Christ which sanctifieth and maketh just,  
and



and bringeth into the true Obedience, Works and Righteousness of Faith, and to live by Faith, as the Just doth, *James 2. 26.*

Page 48. But Faith as a work is not opposed to (nor excludes) it self, as T. D. saith, because in one sense it is opposed to the deeds of the Law, for true Faith, as a Work, is the Work of God, which is not opposed to it self; besides, it being the work of God, to believe in Christ, this hath no relation to those deeds of the Law that the Jews wrought out of him, and out of, (or besides) that Faith wherein they fell short of the Righteousness of the true and living Faith, and of the perfect Obedience or Righteousness of the Law.

Now seeing he confesseth page 49. to a righteousness bestowed upon men by Faith, I ask, if that man is not a partaker and enjoyer of that righteousness by Faith? Surely Faith and its Righteousness are not separate nor divided. Also he confesseth, *Faith in God, through the Messiah is called a walking humbly with God, Micah 6. 8.* To this I say, whilst he thus considereth Faith as such a walking; were it not very gross nonsense and contradiction to say that it excludes it self, as before? or that those works or effects of Faith, (viz.) Walking humbly with God, were opposed to the Faith it self, which is the Root thereof? But this is even like T. Vinet's affirming Faith to be opposite not only to the works of the Law, but to its own Works.

Page 51. I find T. D. upon *James 2. 24.* doth not distinguish betwixt the Works of Faith, and the Works of the Law, and so talks like an ignorant blind Guide, with his vain babling, and perverting of the Scripture to exclude perfect Obedience and Perfection from the Believers.

And seeing he granteth, that *Justification imports the Absolution of Sinners, and the Approbation of a Believer*, which he distinguisheth betwixt: Then it is to be minded, that a Believer, that is approved of, is absolved, being Justified, and what from, if not from Sin and Transgression? Otherwise Faith that stands but in a bare profession, without a living work of purifying the heart, overcoming the World, &c. is but a dead Faith, as T. D. is *fine* confesseth.

And we are Justified by works, as our Faith is made perfect by works, *James 2. 22.* but these are not the works of the Law, but the Works of the Living Faith, which manifesteth Fruit to God,

and

and demonstrate the nature of the Living Faith: But his telling of a *Sinner being justified in the sight of God*, will re doth the Scripture say that he quotes *Rom. 3. 29.* to prove it, but it doth not; but only that a man by Faith is justified without the deeds of the Law, which deeds of the Law a man may be justified without, and yet not a Sinner, nor without the Obedience, Works or Righteousness of the True and Living Faith which Purifieth the heart, and Justifieth from all those things from which they could not be justified by the Law of *Moses*.

And as to his saying, *That we are made free meritoriously, by the Law of the Spirit in us, from the Law of Sin and Death*: (The word meritoriously, he addeth). But the freedom of the Law of the Spirit in us from the Law of Sin and Death, we do confess; and that it is the same Law of the Spirit of Life that is in Christ and the Saints, according to the Apostles Doctrine; the Freedom of which we testify is of Everlasting worth; for that it is not wrought by our selves, but by Christ and his Law and Spirit.

Pag. 52. T. D. saith, *That we observe that the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in the Persons of the Saints*.

Indeed we do observe it, believe it, and experience it, and do not wholly put it off from us, to be fulfilled in the Person of Christ, as T. D. and some of his Brethren have corruptly done; though we do confess that the Righteousness of the Law was fulfilled in Christ's Person; but not therefore to exclude it out of us, since that he was a faithful Example to be followed, as well as a Captain and Leader to guide in all the Wayes of Peace and true Holiness.

Pag. 52. And as we do observe that the Righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in the Persons of the Saints, contrary to T. D. and his Brethrens observation; and thereupon not only suppose, but really assert a state of Freedom from Sin attainable in this life; we do not place the Merit of Justification upon the Creatures imperfect obedience or works; but originally on the Spirit of Truth, and its perfect work, in which Spirit Christ perfectly obeyed; offered up himself a Lamb without spot to God; and we know that it is the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ that makes us free from the Law of Sin and Death, *Romans 8.* which Freedom is effected within.

Page 53. If there be a connexion between Justification and Sanctification; and that the same Christ Jesus that Justifieth by his Blood, Sanctifieth by his Spirit, as is manifest (from Gal. iii. 2. in Gal. 2.) then must we not be justified whilst we are un sanctified, seeing that it is self evident, by a holy life; but then here in T. D. seems doubtful; as rather enclining to lay it upon the active obedience of Christ; but then neither he that is Sanctified and Justified, being in an holy life; a partaker of Christ's Righteousness, Obedience, and Subjection by the Spirit of Life; and the pure Law of it? seeing this makes free from the Law of Sin and Death? But then he wavers again to the understanding of some who suppose the end of Christ's coming into the World is; that God's Righteous Law might not be absolutely consumed, but might be observed (though imperfectly) by Believers; others, (saith he) of the Impiety of Christ's Surety's Righteousness, &c. This imperfect observation of God's Rigorous Laws is that he would fain center in, and which added the terror of most of his discourse amounts to, though it be not the end of Christ's sending into the World, nor yet the work of the Spirit and Law of Life within; for the end thereof was to destroy sin, and to work man's perfect freedom from it, which they that experience are only the true and real subjects of Christ's Righteousness, and know the true imputation thereof, and effect and real benefit of his being a Surety of the new Testament, wherein the Promises of God are fulfilled to and in man, and man brought under the obligation of that Law and Covenant which tends to the exaltation of Truth and Righteousness in the Earth; and the bringing the Creature into a perfect and peaceable subjection unto its Maker: So Christ's being both our Surety, Advocate, Intercessor and Mediator between God and man, is to make both Unity, Reconciliation and Peace betwixt them; a Mediator being not a Mediator of one, but betwixt two, &c. to bring into mutual agreement.

T. D. Our good and our evil works are not perfectly contrary, for our evil works are perfectly evil, for, *malum sit ex quolibet defectu*, any one defect make our works evil, but our good works are but imperfectly good.

Ans. If good works and evil works be not perfectly contrary, where and what then are the good works, whilst defect and imperfection is pleaded for, which makes them evil? Surely good and evil

are perfectly contrary; but by this man's consequence, there is no good works whilst defects and imperfections remain in them; and then why doth he call them good works? It appears he gives them that name which is improper to them; but if good works be really acknowledged, as we know they are in Scripture, and that they that are truly so, are wrought in the Light, and so in God, these are perfectly contrary to evil; but such T. D. as his Brethren with their sins and imperfections are strangers to, whilst they shew themselves to be out of the Light wherein the good works are wrought; and as to the condignity he speaks of, (or worth) as with relation to the infinite reward, we do, as before, place it in that Heavenly Image, Spirit and Life which brings forth the good works which were obtained of God, and it is that Spirit which leads its Followers to the infinite reward of Life and Salvation.

*Arg. 4. Rom. 2. 13. Not the Hearers of the Law are Justified before God, but the Doers of the Law shall be Justified; to this T. D. saith; The words give a reason of the Jews perishing who had the Law, (viz.) the old Covenant.*

*Reply.* The reason of their perishing was their Disobedience unto the Law; but this, of the Doers of the Law, wherein both the Just and Justified stare is intimated; according to the Gospel, verse 14, 15, 16, relates to those *Gentiles* which had not the Law outwardly, and yet did by nature the things contained in the Law, which the Apostle renders as a reason and proof of their Justification, who shewed the Work of the Law written in their hearts, which Law was pure and Spiritual, converting the Souls; and here it is also evident, that the matter or things contained in the Law, they had both in Power and Operation, who had it not in the Letter of it; but the extent of this is and hath been much opposed by T. D. and such as he, who have grossly perverted the Scriptures for their own sinfull and corrupt ends to their own and others destruction.

*Of Perfection.* And now that a state of Freedom from sin is attainable in this life, this T. D. erroneously sets down as an Error, and argues against it as followeth.

*Arg. 1. If no meer man ever attained to any such state, then it is not attainable, but no meer man ever did.*

*Ans.* His term *meer man* is his own, and not ours; what he means

means by *meer man*, is a question; for it may be taken variously, as first, he may be deemed a meer man, that is, without God, Christ or the guidance of his Spirit, who lives to himself; in which state we never said that freedom from sin was attainable by any meer man; for without Christ we can do nothing. Secondly, if *meer man* be taken singly, as *purus homo*, or man purely or intirely without mixture of those things which are either contrary to him, as *Man*, or not proper to his being Man, (as sin and transgression were improper to him) for so he was in his first Creation in Innocency and primitive Purity; as so considered, to deny him Perfection, or Freedom from sin, were to deny him that which God did invest him with whilst he was in his Maker's Image, which was proper to him, and to which Christ comes to restore man again out of the Fall: But then T. D. explains what he means by *meer man*; viz. *such as the eminently holy Persons in the Scriptures, whom he denies to have ever attained a state of Perfection*; by which he has accused all the holy Men of God at once, as but *meer men*, in the worst sence; and such were they that were carnal, and walked as men, 1 Cor. 3. 3. and he hath therein both opposed God's Commands, Promises, and Works, as also the end of Christ's manifestation, which was perfectly to restore man out of sin and unrighteousness unto God, see Gen. 3. 15. Rom. 16. 20. Deut. 6. 5. and 10. 12. and 11. 1. and 13. 18. and 19. 9. Matth. 22. 37. Mark 12. 30. Gen. 17. 1. Deut. 18. 13. 2 Sam. 22. 33. Psal. 18. 32. and 37. 27. and 119. 1, 2, 3, 4. Isa. 1. 16. John 13. 8. Isa. 4. 4. and 60. 21, Ezek. 36. 25, 26, 27, 33. Jer. 33. 8. Hebr. 8. and chap. 10. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. Zeph. 3. 13. Hosea 14. 3. Job. 17. 11. Tit. 2. 14. Ephes. 5. 25, 26, 27. 1 John 3. 1 Cor. 2. 6. Col. 1. 28, 29. ch. 4. 12. 2 Tim. 3. 17. James 1. 4.

But what sin or sins he can charge upon either the holy Patriarchs, Prophets or Apostles that they were not freed from perfectly before their decease, this he hath yet to shew and evince to us, concerning all them that died in the Faith, who finished their Testimony with Joy and Peace.

T. D. Arg. 2. *That there is a continual need and use of Faith and Repentance in this life; therefore, &c.*

*Ans.* That there is a continual need of Repentance, this I deny; for true Repentance, where it is wrought, and the fruits of it brought

brought forth, this is unto Salvation never to be repented of, and is attended with a real forsaking of sin and transgression, this is beyond your fained repentance and humility, which is still to be repented of, as the sins of your best performances are: also True and Living Faith purifies the heart, and is the Saints Victory, and the exercise of it through that Divine Power and Love by which it works against temptations and the fiery darts of the Devil, after the mind and heart is cleared from sin and pollution: it being one thing for man to sin, and another Only to be tempted to sin; so that it is a falsehood to say, *that there is a like reason for a continual need of Repentance in this life, as there is for the use of Faith*; neither doth that 1 Cor. 13. *ult.* prove that Repentance abideth with Faith, Hope and Charity, as falsely T. D. reasons; might he not as well say, there is the same reason for repentance to abide, that there is for Charity to abide, seeing that Faith, Hope and Charity abide; whereas Charity is the Bond of Perfection, Col. 3. 14. and Love is the fulfilling of the Law; and the end of the Commandment is Love out of a *pure Heart*, which positively opposeth T. D's sinfull Doctrine for sin and imperfection, which tends greatly to pervert people, and to keep his Hearers in unbelief, whilst he doth not only deny that ever any attained to perfection but affirms Freedom from Sin not attainable in this life, which is his gross ignorance and unbelief of Christ and his Power, which is greater and stronger then the Devil and all his attempts, and is able to overcome him, and to destroy his works; and in this Power of Christ the Faith of the Righteous stands, and this we contend for against the Devil and all his sinfull Agents, who thus mannage and maintain his work.

And how falsely is it for T. D. pag. 56. to say, *that Charity or Love suits our present imperfect state*; [as he also saith, Faith and Hope doth,] whereas Charity or Love which is the Bond of perfectness, and is known in the pure heart suits that State which is of its own nature, as *Perfection and Purity* is, which is also effected through the true Faith that purifies the heart, and that hope which he that hath purified himself even as he is pure, 1 John 3. which admits not of *sin and imperfection term of life*; for he that abideth in Christ sinneth not. And as to that of Phil. 3. Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; to which T. D. saith, *He denies in one verse what he affirms in another; if the word perfect be in both places*



places understood in the same sense, verse 12. 25. To vers. 12. I say, that *Paul* did not say that Perfection was not attainable in this life; neither doth it appear to be his judgment, for then why should he follow after, reach forth, or press forward unto those things before, and plainly say, Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded? Whereto we have already attained let us walk by the same Rule: Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so, as you have us for an Example, vers. 15, 16, 17. Surely he was not an Example of sin and imperfection, but of purity and holiness; yet notwithstanding he then both expected and believed a growth in the Spiritual and Divine Understanding and Apprehension of that for which he was apprehended of Christ; so the Perfection he had not already (then) attained, relating to such an apprehension as he speaks of, doth not exclude that state of Perfection and integrity that he was then brought and apprehended into of Christ Jesus, as to the Purity and Righteousness which he was a partaker of in Christ; for the Child of God its growth in Strength, Wisdom and Spiritual Understanding doth not render it sinful or impure in the nature and properties of it, but rather shews its Purity and Innocency the more in that its truly capable of such a growth.

Page 56, 57. But then, when is this freedom from Sin, or state of Holiness (which T. D. saith will be in a proper sense perfect) attainable, if not in this life?

T. D. *The Saints shall be invested with it at the Resurrection, called, The Resurrection of the Dead, Metonymically, in the Life to come indeed we shall be like God.*

Reply, By this we may understand that he has put off Freedom from sin from all Gods People till the life to come. and not only so, but till this *Metonymical Resurrection* (according to his terms) which he may understand is not as yet to any of the deceased, though the Life to come that's Everlasting, (as intended) is by the Righteous enjoyed after this life. I do not intend here to dispute his terms of the Resurrection, but admitting it in his sense, my end is to shew how he has excluded all the Saints both deceased, and yet remaining, from a state of freedom from sin, as not being yet attained to it, if this Resurrection he intends be yet to come; and then, where are they in the mean time? where are their Souls? where are their

sins and pollutions and imperfections, if all be yet uncleansed and not freed from sin? will not T. D's Doctrine herein meet, and be one with the Popes touching a Purgatory; for if none be perfectly cleansed here, and yet none come to God, or into his Kingdom unclean, they must be clesed somewhere; he should have told us the Place of Purging, which is not in the Grave, not in Hell, nor in the Pit; and it must be before Heaven be entred into; what place then between both, if T. D's Doctrine must be owned for Catholick or Authentick? but, who is it that are not meer Papist, or that have nor drunk up his corrupt Doctrines, that cannot see him, his Popery, Ignorance, Confusion and Error herein. And what Popery he hath at unawares run himself into, is now obvious.

And *Matth. 5. 48.* Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect; to this T. D. saith, *Such Commands are the Measure of our Duty, not of our Attainments in this Life.*

*Reply.* Thus he perverts and diminisheth the righteous Commands of God, as if God had either required a thing not attainable; or as if being perfect, as he is perfect, were but the measure of our Duty, and so to be put off till the Life to come, wherein the Saints had not such Commands given to them, seeing they are not capable of sinning in the Life to come; but *John* said, As is he, so are we in this world, *1 John 4. 17.* And herein they knew their Love made perfect; and this is more then either the small resemblance of Children to their Parents which T. D. speaks of, and beyond his imperfect sinfull state and Doctrine; for the perfect Love which they had, was in them a perfect resemblance of God, who is Love, verse 16. But this way of T. D. his slighting and diminishing, and falsly interpreting the Commands of God, which require such perfection, only as the measure of our Duty, is like his Brethren, saying, *That a Child of God, his not committing Sin is so be meant, he doth not make a trade of Sin;* which indeed is a very easie way they have taken to pervert the Commands of God, and to give ease and liberty to the Transgressors in their sins; as if when a thing is absolutely required of them, they should put it off with this, *It is meant only as but in part to be obeyed; and so if they should deal thus with God, and say, Lord, then requires us not to Steal, or not to commit Adultery, or not to Cover;* but we are to understand it, as that we cannot altogether abstain from Stealing, Adultery or Covetousness,  
only

only we are not to make a trade of these things, nor wholly make it our business to be employed in them; what acceptance do they think such a Plea would have before the Lord? and what Answer would he make them to this their corruption? and what resentment would such Doctrine have in the minds of sober people, if they should preach them; and give such meanings to the Scriptures; and tell them that where Stealing, and Adultery, and worldly Lusts and Covetousness are forbidden, that they are not to go to the extent of the Commands, but only not make a trade or a common practice of Stealing, or these things &c? for thus they have dealt with many of God's Commands enjoying perfect Holiness and Righteousness; but then they have an easie way to lay all upon Christ, as having paid their debt, and fulfilled the Righteousness of the Law in his Person in their stead, so that they must not expect its fulfilling in their persons; for where the Scripture speaks of its being fulfilled in us, we are to understand by *in us*, that it is in *Christ's Person*; and this is the manner of their course from time to time, both to shut Christ his Works and Righteousness out of People, so much as in them lies.

1 John 3:9. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit Sin. T. D. saith to this, *We may interpret it, as he is born of God he doth not sin; every Child of God is mixta persona*, (Pag. 57.) *as our Law says of the King, consists of an old and new nature; and so his new nature is Principium quo, the Principle from which he acts graciously; and the old nature, the Principle from which he acts sinfully.*

Reply, Here again he hath palpably perverted plain Scripture, and contradicted the Apostle John, as may be seen in that 1 John 3. For he that is born of God, who doth neither commit sin, nor can sin, because he is born of God, has put off the old nature, and is not acted by that Principle which leads to act sinfully, because he cannot sin; and that gracious Principle in him hath overcome the sin, and the nature of it; and so to tell of his being *mixta persona* is T. D.'s gross blindness: For first, that which is born of God, that overcomes the World, is not mixt with sin, nor with the old sinful nature. Secondly, He, or whosoever is born of God, whose Seed remains in him, who abideth in Christ is not acted by that old sinful nature; because he is born of God, and abideth in Christ, in whom is no sin; neither is mans having divers parts, as Body and Soul

Soul, &c. or his being liable or not liable to death, any reason to shew that he that is born of God doth act sinfully from the old nature; for the Bodies of the Saints were the Temples of the Holy Ghost; and their Bodies were sanctified, and so brought into subjection unto the Divine Spirit or Principle in them, so as they might glorifie God in their bodies, and in their spirits, which were his.

Again, T. D's meaning to that first of John 3. 9. is, *That it may intend the manner of sinning, so the 8th verse seems to limit it; he that committeth sin is of the Devil, for the Devil sinneth from the beginning; the Comparison (quoth he) is not between the act simply, for then it should have been said only, for the Devil sinneth, but from the beginning, implies a Comparison between the manner of man's sin and the Devils, in respect of which he is said to be of the Devil, because he imitates his example, who from the day he began never ceased to sin, nor ever did one truly good action.*

*Observe.* By this we may gather T. D's limitation put upon that of John 3. 9. and the Comparison he makes between not the act simply, but the manner of mans sin and the Devils, still taking it for granted that he that is born of God doth sin, and acts sinfully from the old nature, but not in that manner as he that is of the Devil, who intimates his example; so that his meaning and comparison seems to amount to this, that he that is born of God doth sin, but not always, or not as the Devil sinneth, he is somewhat better then the Devil, in that he doth some good actions, but the Devil doth none.

*Reply,* Surely our opposer hath come off but very poorly in his arguing for the Devils work, contrary both to the state and testimony of such as were born of God, whom he hath here very meanly debased, and sadly abused the Scriptures, misrepresenting Gods Children whom he by his Eternal Power hath delivered from the power of Sin and Satan, and given them a Heavenly place in Christ, where the Devil cannot come, and in whom the Prince of the World hath nothing, nor his sinfull Ministers any part or interest whilst they plead against God's Promises, holy Commands, and against the very end and purpose of Christ's manifestation, as T. D. and his Brethren have done, wherein they have shown themselves to be Antichrist's Agents and Ministers, and not the true Christ's.

Now touching Christ's Enlightning every man, whose Light we affirm to be saving; this is set down *Of the Light as an Error* by T. D. he and his Brethren denying the Light of Christ, in every man, to be Saving in its own nature and property, which we do affirm it to be; but that he enlightens every man to *Salvation*, I do not remember these to be our words, as T. D. lays them down; who also begins with a meer falsehood against us, saying, *That the word Christ is never blind to delude the ignorant; for the Quakers denying Christ to be God, they cannot own him for the Author of Illumination.*

*Answer.* This is an apparent Slander cast upon us, as our Books and Writings do shew, that we never denied Christ to be God, or his Divinity; still affirming, That in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and that in him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men, and that was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the World, as in *John 1. 1. 4. 9.* Now to detect us as being in an Error herein, T. D. urgeth *Ephes. 2. 12.* that at that time ye were without Christ, having no hope, &c. which is no proof that they had none of Christ's Light in them, though they then did not experience him their Hope; nor were come to the Covenant, being without God in the World; in which state they were Strangers and Enemies in their minds, the mystery was hid from them, the Light was obscured from their understandings, it shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not; but it doth not follow that the Light was not in them, because they were without God in the World, no more then it follows that God is not in the World, because the World knows him not; whereas its plain, that he was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not, *John 1. 10.* and seeing Christ as God is acknowledged to be the Author of Illumination, his illumination is Divine and Spiritual, and therefore saving to them that believe in it; and God's Presence filleth Heaven and Earth; neither can Darkness it self, nor the Deep, nor Hell hide or cover man from the Presence of God, nor yet obscure him from the reach of his Spirit; Whether shall I go from thy Spirit, or whether shall I fly from thy Presence; if I ascend up into Heaven, thou art there; if I make my Bed in Hell, behold, thou art there; if I take the wings of the Morning, &c. *Psal. 139.* Yet still I grant  
th

that there is a state in which all are ignorant of God, and in which the Mystery, to wit, Christ within, the hope of Glory, hath been hid from Ages and Generations, but is shewed, revealed and made manifest to the true Believers in his Light, who said, Believe in the Light, that you may be the Children of the Light; and Christ said, I am come a Light into the World, that whosoever believeth in me might not perish, but have Eternal Life; and this we testify to, against all Opposers of his Light, as it is in every man.

Pag. 59. And where T. D. argues that the Gentiles for a time had no Promises of Christ; therefore knew of none, and consequently had not a Light, or Knowledge sufficient to bring them to Salvation.

Reply, What time was that the Gentiles had no Promise of Christ and how long wast it? Was not the Promise of God after the Fall (that the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpents head) of a general extent, as well towards Gentiles as Jews? For was not Adam and Eve the first Parents of both, to whom this Promise was made? Secondly, The Promise that was made to Abraham whilst in the uncircumcision, did not this relate to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, see Rom. 4. and Galat. throughout? And thirdly, Was not Christ's Death for all, still a confirmation, or evident Testimony to the fore-going Promises and Covenant of God towards both Jews and Gentiles? but, and if there was some time or Ages in which the Gentiles had no Promises of Christ, and therefore not a Light sufficient to Salvation, according to T. D. then it follows that none of them in that time, or those Ages could be saved; and why? but because God did not afford them a sufficient Light, which assertion and consequence lays the blame upon God; but the falsehood thereof, who is it that know the Scriptures that cannot see? Again, where he puts Light for Knowledge, herein he doth not reach our Principle, for many have a true Light in them, that are not come to the true Knowledge; for it is the Light that shines in the heart that gives the knowledge of the Glory of God, 2 Cor. 4. so the Light is there before the Knowledge is given; and in that its able to give that Knowledge, it is sufficient to save.

And where he brings 1 Tim. 3. ver. last, for proof, That the Gentiles neither had, nor knew any Promises of Christ for a time, where (he saith) God manifested in the Flesh, and as such, preach'd unto the Gentiles; are made two parts of the Mystery of Godliness, which in  
other



other Ages was not made known unto the Sorts of men, as its now revealed to his holy Apostles and Prophets, by the Spirit, &c. Where note, first, that this manifestation of God in the Flesh, and preaching unto the Gentiles, is no proof that either they had no promises of Christ before, or that they had no Light in them sufficient to salvation; for if so, then all Gentiles in all Ages before that time were condemned for want of saving Light being given to them; which were a gross error to assert. 2dly, As to the manifestation of the mystery of God and Christ, I grant that it was more large and open in the Apostles days then for Ages before, as also, that was made manifest then, which was hid for Ages and Generations; yet still it doth not follow that the Gentiles before had not a Light sufficient to save; or to manifest the mystery of Godliness in some degree. 3dly, But yet T. D. his arguing against the Gentiles having a sufficient Light before Christ's coming in the flesh; however, if we could grant him his plea (which we cannot) it doth not follow that now the Gentiles, or the whole world, hath not a Light sufficient given them, since Christ is so come manifestly, testified as God's Salvation, prepared before the face of all People, being a Light to the Gentiles, and his Testimony so signally confirmed, as it hath been also both by his works and sufferings.

But yet the better to inform our Opposers of the Light, let them read *John 1.* where speaking of the Word that was God, that made all things, its said, In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men, verse 4. and this Light and Life of men which proceeds from the Word, though it was before Christ's coming in the Flesh, yet it was still the Light and Life of Christ born witness of, and more fully manifested through his coming, or being sent in the fullness of time.

Page. 60. T. D. *The Father is said to hide the object, because he did not enlighten the subject, i. e. to hide the Gospel, because he did not enlighten their minds with the saving knowledge of it.*

*Answer.* This his *Because* is grounded upon his former Error, for the cause of hiding the mysteries of God's Salvation and Kingdom, is mens opposing and resisting his Light and Spirit in them; so the cause is not originally in God, though he gives men up to their darkness and unbelief when they have rejected his Light; but it is the god of the World that hath blinded their minds from seeing the Light of

the glorious Gospel of Christ, 2 Cor. 4. and the natural mans not receiving the things of the Spirit, 1 Cor. 2. 14. doth not prove that he hath no Light of the Spirit given to him, or in him though he, as such, cannot know the things of the Spirit, his knowledge and discerning being but natural, yet that a man in that state may be changed in his mind and understanding by that which is Spiritual, is evident; for if he were not convertible, what would preaching to him signifie? and what is it in him that can answer to, and receive the Spiritual Testimony of Truth and Salvation?

Pag. 61. To Joh. 1. 9. That was the true Light which lighteth every man, &c. T. D. answers, *Christ being spoken of before, as the Messias, we must therefore understand the place, I think, not of natural Light, but supernatural; not of the Light of Reason, but of the Light of the Gospel, &c.*

Reply, This is enough, he has confessed sufficient to break the neck of his own Cause, and his Brethrens, who have affirmed the Light in every man to be insufficient, as but the Light of Nature, of Reason, of Natural Conscience, &c. but now he thinks it is not Natural, but Supernatural, the Light of the Gospel &c. which must needs be saving: Its well that at length, after his dark oppositions against the Light, both at the Dispute we had with him, about ten years ago, at *Sandwich*, as also in his silly confused Pamphlet, stiled, *The Quakers Folly*; but it were well if he would retain those better thoughts of the Light in every man its being Supernatural, the Light of the Gospel, &c. and then he will not oppose the Quakers, as he hath done; but that whilst he follows his thoughts, and doth not come to be directed by this Light in him, he proves wavering and uncertain in his thoughts; for in his following distinction between being *Lighted* and *Inlightened*, he renders *Inlightning*, as to the Eyes of the Understanding, from Eph. 1. 18. but *Lighted*, as when *Candle is carried before us, as a Blind man*, P. 62. which Comparison is impertinently, and very improperly brought in this matter; for he was not speaking before of an outward Light, as that of a Candle before a Blind man; for it is absurd amongst men to offer a Blind man a Candle to light him, or shew him his way into a Room, when he is out of all capacity of seeing or receiving any benefit by it; but thus T. D. renders Christ's lightning men, when before he granted it to be Supernatural, the Light of the Gospel, wherewith the Me-  
sias

fiat enlightens men; which as it is not outward and natural, so it is only seen and known inwardly and spiritually: But then T. D. to come off faith, *The meaning can be no more than this, that whosoever are enlightened are enlightened by him*: What a silly shuffle and evasion is this, from his former granting, that it was every man that cometh into the World that he enlightens, when now, but in the very next page it is, *whosoever are enlightened are enlightened*; and a little before that, *many that are lighted are not enlightened, but are like a Blind man, solighted, that sees never the better when a Candle is carried before him*; so, by this he makes God's offering men Light neither to be of any effect to them, nor yet like to be, if they can have no more benefit by it then a Blind man hath by the Light of a Candle. What then can be God's end in lightening them? what doth it signifie to them, if they be so wholly incapable of seeing ever the better? Doth he then bid them look, bid them walk aright in the strait Path? and doth he condemn them for not walking therein, when they are altogether incapable of it, as from Sight or Light sufficient, as his Comparison before implies? Alas, alas, what a cruel unjust and unequal Master would this render God? and how unlike to himself doth it represent him whose Wayes are equal, Love universal, and Grace free; (who first gives Light within, and opens the Eye within, before man can walk aright) however his Light within be gainsayed by such Blind Guides, as T. D. who are but in their thoughts, vain imaginations, and notions, knowing what they know naturally, and preach for Doctrine mens Traditions.

Pag. 62. Rom. 2. 15. T. D. saith, touching those Gentiles that shewed the Work of the Law writ in their hearts, *That it cannot be understood of a Saving Knowledge; and it is not the Law in their hearts, &c.* (but yet a little after confesseth) *that the Law may be said to be in their hearts, in their understandings, &c.*

Reply, How then were they excused according to the Gospel? and how then did the Apostle bring them as a Proof of Justification? verse 13, 14. Could they be justified without a Saving Knowledge? But of T. D's ignorance in this much have been manifested both by S. Fisher, and some others. And how saith he in page 63. *That the Gentiles in this sence had not the Law in their hearts; (viz.) a suitable disposition to the Law, as his words are*? what nature was it by

which they did those things contained in it? how was it unsutable to the Law? or how could that do those things contained in the Law without a sutable disposition to it? Surely, a mean understanding may perceive T. D's ignorance and Error in this particular as well as in the rest; for the Law of God in their hearts was Spiritual, and so was its effects in them; and that nature by which they obeyed it, was not opposite to it, but in unity with it; which nature was contrary to that in the Jews which led them to break and violate the Law of God; But as for those *Gentiles* that liked not to retain God in their Knowledge, *Rom. 1. 26.* and those that said to God, Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy Wayes, *Job 21. 14.* These instances do not at all prove that those *Gentiles* which obeyed the Law of God wanted a sutable disposition to it; for this was in the rebellious state that they said, depart from us, and liked not to retain God in their knowledge; howbeit, this proves (against our Opposer) first, that some knowledge of God was afforded even them that liked not to retain it. And secondly, that God was nigh them that said to him, depart from us; and that also he would have afforded them the knowledge of his Wayes; and also it is evident that they were troubled, condemned and reproved by his Witness in their Consciences, or else, how should they say depart from us, if he never came nigh them, nor ever touched their Consciences? or why should they say, we desire not the knowledge of thy Wayes, if the knowledge thereof was not tendred to them?

And further, If so be that the *Gentiles* (as confessed) were those in whom that which might be known of God was manifested and shewed unto them from the Creation, to the being of God and his Eternal Power, which discovery did leave them without excuse; what was it that brought them to this understanding of the Eternal Power and Godhead from and through the Creation? was it Spiritual yea or nay? surely this clear sight and discovery in them did rise from that which might be known of God, that was manifest in them: and if this had not a sufficiency in it to save, how were they left without excuse? surely the fault was not to be laid upon God, nor on his Light in them, but to and upon themselves for disobeying it, and not liking to retain him in their knowledge.

And seeing Christ is confessed, page 63. to be set for a Light to the

the Gentiles, *Iſa. 49. 6.* which, ſaith T. D. is but a Propheſy of the Gentiles mercy in the time of Chriſt's actual exhibition in the Fleſh.

However, this Mercy is of a large extent, and for ever to be prized, as in the fulnels of time it is more manifeſt then before; and now eſpecially ſince it is thus openly declared and manifeſted, it ought not to be thus oppoſed and ſlighted by men of corrupt minds which affirm it is an error to ſay that Chriſt enlightens ever man that cometh into the World, and yet at length are forced to confeſs it, as in theſe words; viz. *That it is Supernatural, the Light of the Goſpel, of the Meſſias, &c.* And thus they are confounded and broken to pieces, and their wiſdom turned backward by this convincing Light, this ſtumbling ſtone, this Rock of offence, which they cannot avoid ſtumbling at, and falling upon and breaking to pieces, who ſet themſelves againſt it, and bring forth their vain imaginations to eclipse its glory, as too many of this Generation hath done.

And now touching the Scriptures being a Declaration of the Word of God, but not the *Of the Scriptures.* Word, nor the only Rule of Faith and Life; which T. D. ſets down as an Error, wherein he hath no leſs then accused the Scriptures themſelves with being Error. For, firſt, we in calling them a *true Declaration*, we call them what they call themſelves, *Luke 1.* as alſo that they are *Writings* given forth by the holy men of God; and that which they call the *Word*, we do alſo, the *Word was in the beginning with God, John 1.* and his Name is called the *Word of God*, yet both the Doctrinal part, and Hiſtorical part of the Scripture, contained in the Books of the Old and New Testaments we own, and never ſlighted nor denied; yet if we ſhould look upon them as the only Rule of Faith and Life, this would exclude the Rule and guidance of the Spirit (for the only Rule muſt be infallible, certain, incorruptible, obvious, &c.) which leads into all Truth, as either not ſufficient ſo to guide, or not to be owned as the Rule of Faith and Obedience to God, &c. and this would be contrary to the Testimonies of the holy men of God concerning it, who followed it, and directed others to it, and to walk in this Spirit, and therein they knew their ſeveral attainments and meaſures, and herein was the Rule of the new Creature, who worſhipped not in the oldneſs of the Letter, but in the newneſs of the Spirit, *Rom. 7. 6.*

2 Cor. 10. 13, 14, 15. Phil. 3. 15, 16. Gal. 6. 15, 16. And we know that without the guidance of this Spirit of Truth men can never come to a right judgment nor understanding of the holy Scriptures, or Spiritual things.

And how then doth T. D. go to prove the Scripture to be the Word, and the only Rule of Faith and Life, whilst he hath granted, that to bring a testimony of Scripture concerning it self, were *petitio principii*, a begging the question, and were insignificant for their conviction which deny its Divine Authority.

What course then will he take to convince such ? seeing he himself doth but follow his notions, conceivings, and humane understanding, while Divine Revelation, and immediate Inspiration are laid aside and opposed in these dayes by such as he ; Pag. 65. he saith he will give a taste of our Arguments, and leave our tenents to the judgment of the understanding, &c.

What understanding and what Judgment must be the Guide and Rule of mens judgements and understandings, if the Light within must not be the Rule ? for after he hath asserted the Scriptures to be the only Rule of Faith, presently he hath put himself upon a Hanck, and shakes his own Foundation, in confessing the Scriptures insufficient for the conviction of such who deny its Divine Authority ; otherwise, its but a begging the question, to go to prove the Scriptures by themselves ; and now what he will erect as a Rule instead thereof, for the conviction of such, whilst he hath opposed the Light within, and asserted the insufficiency of the Scriptures (shewing them not to be the only Rule) is questionable whether he knoweth himself, if he doth, let him tell it to them that desire it.

And Pag. 66. It is to be observed, one while he tell us of the Judgment of the Understanding ; another while the matter contained in the Scriptures was the Rule before it was committed in writing, and that the Gospel was preached to Adam. And again, when they affirm the Scripture to be the only Rule ; its intended to them who have the Scriptures, and not to them that have them not, Pag. 67. And presently after we must understand this point with connexion with the former, the Light within : So do but mark what confusion here is : First, 'tis his own confession that the matter contained in the Scripture was before it was written : Secondly, That to them who



who have not *the Scriptures* something must be the Rule; and what, is it *the Light within*, having no other way as he saith? Now, if the Light within and the matter contained in the Scriptures be a sufficient Rule to them which have them not in the Writing, surely, its sufficiency is not diminished by the writing, but rather testified unto; neither is it the intent of the Scriptures to draw people from either the matter, or Light within, which opens them, nor to set up Scriptures as the only Rule instead thereof.

But then saith T. D. *that very Scripture*, Rom. 10. 8. *speaks not of the Light within, but of the Scriptures.*

*Ans.* It speaks of the very same Word which *Moses* and the Prophets spake of which was before the Scriptures were written; in *Moses's* time much of them was unwritten, and yet he directed the people to the *Word*; and the Apostle called it the Word of Faith which was nigh them in their mouthes, and in their hearts: but saith T. D. *It is not the Light within, but the Scriptures*, as if he should say the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were in their mouthes and hearts; but this Word of which they give testimony, was in the hearts of all the holy men of God, that gave forth the Scriptures before they writ them; and it was a Lamp to *David's* feet, and a Light to his path; and he hid it in his heart, that he might not sin, &c. *Psal.* 119. 11. & verse 115. and the *Word* is forever settled in Heaven, verse 89. this was that which quickned sanctified and saved the Righteous in and thorow all Generations, and of this the Scriptures or *Writings* do testify; in which are words of God, but the Word was before they were spoke or writ.

And T. D's accusing the Quakers for *not owning the Authority of the Scriptures*, is false, for we are in the Spirit that gave forth, and openeth, and brings to the right use and end of them, and in the same Spirit can and do make use of them, not only to prove our Tenents, and to Confute our Opposers, but also to obey and practice the things contained in them (which are truly moral and Christian) as the Spirit of Truth doth direct and enable.

T. D. *We are not now to expect any new discovery of Truth, as to the matter revealed, but only as to the person whom God enlightens gradually to discern the evidence of what is revealed in Scripture.*

*Ans.* First, If no new Discovery, then what is in Scriptures; then no need of Popish and Heathenish Authors to prove distinct  
and

and separate personal Substances in God, nor any other such traditional distinctions which obscures the simplicity of Scripture Truth, and darkens the minds, of People, but people should rather be referred singly to the Scripture Phrase and Language, and to search them in the Light of Christ within.

Secondly, if the discerning of the Scripture is from God's enlightning them, people ought to be recommended to God, to wait in his Light to know his Counsel and direction therein, or otherwise they will remain ignorant of the Scriptures and Revelation of the things declared.

Again, its well that T. D. *confesseth that there are Prophecies and Histories of things done before the Pen-mens birth, as also personal experiences, &c.* So now at length he doth a little assent, to Truth, as if he were a little convinced by S. Fisher's Answer to him, that he doth not now bind up all to the Scriptures, but confesseth that *Prophecies, Histories, and personal experiences to be before the Pen-mens birth*: But herein he hath but manifested his uncertainty and wavering to and again, one while opposing the Sufficiency of the Light, and placing all upon the Scriptures as the *only Rule*, another while upon the *matter contained* in the Scriptures, which was before the Scriptures were written, and was *written on the heart of the Gentiles*; another while the *Light within* he seems to assent unto, as in pag. 67. for them that have not Scripture; another while *Prophecies and Experiences* were before the Scripture; and thus at length the Spirit or Light that gave forth the Scriptures must be preferred as the most certain and universal Guide and Rule; as indeed it is to all them who follow, obey and believe in it; and this Light the blind, corrupt imaginary Teachers (whose knowledge and profession is but natural and traditional) cannot corrupt, as they have done the Scriptures by their false glosses meanings and private interpretations contrary to the intent and end of the Spirit of God which gave them forth, and which leads into all Truth and Righteousness: for a further Answer to T. D. touching this matter, I do refer the Reader to S. Fisher's Book, titled *Rusticum ad Accademicos*.

*Of Baptism and the  
Lords Supper,*

And as for his accusing Quakers with error touching Baptism and the Lords Supper, (as to their ceasing) and setting up the appearance of Christ within, &c.

*Ans.*

*Ans.* The one Baptism, *Ephes. 4. 5.* into the one Body, *1 Cor. 12. 13.* and the eating, drinking and supping with Christ at the table of the Lord in his house and Kingdom we own and experience; but what Baptism it is he intends, whether sprinkling Infants, or *John's* Baptism, he hath not discovered; neither indeed doth it concern him now to make such a frivolous pudder against the Quakers upon this account; for indeed, we do not look upon him either as a true Minister, nor as having a call either from God or man, as one empowered to impose things he calls Ordinances; its probable, when he was Parish Priest at *Sandwich* in *Kent*, in *Cromwel's* time, he could shew a greater force for his impositions then now he can in Houses and Corners, where he and his Brethren can creep, and not only so, but be ready to obscure and hide themselves, if but a little Storm and Trial come: He styles himself sometime *Minister of the Gospel at Sandwich*; || but is not rather that report of him true, that there he was given to Gaming, || *Rather Hiring at Sandwich*. Bowls, and Nine-pins, &c? But as to the appearance and enjoyment of Christ within, we do confess him to be the Substance, and the Living Bread, and in him we are kept not only in a Living remembrance, but also in a real Possession of the Power and Vertue of his Life, having known a conformity to his Death, which is more then a remembrance of it; and we know him to be the enduring Divine Substance, which ends all Types, Shaddows and Figures, and his Coming, and Appearance in the Flesh, wherein he went through the Types and Shaddows; as Circumcision, *John's* Baptism, observing the Passover at his Supper, and his Sufferings, did make way for his coming in the Spirit, as he consecrated a new and living way through the Vail, that is to say his Flesh: now the coming of Christ, until which, his Disciples were to shew forth his Death in the observation of the figure; this coming they did not put afar off, as our Opposers yet do, how long they know not, it being already above Sixteen hundred years since; and yet this his coming is still put off: whereas the Disciples, after they were with Christ at his last Supper, were Witnesses of his coming after his Resurrection, and also of his Spiritual Coming and Revelation in their hearts; and now to suppose that what the Disciples did to shew his Death, was till a third Coming, not yet manifest, is to overlook the two former as no Comings, as also to render Christs own

words and Promises ineffectual, who said, *Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of Death till they see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom*, Matth. 16. 28. Mark 9. Luke 9. 27.

And as to 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, 25, wherein the Apostle repeats what Christ did the same night he was betrayed, in giving the Bread and Cup to shew his Death till he came, &c.

However T. D. construes this, it doth not prove the figurative or outward part or sign to be imposed as of absolute necessity upon all Believers, till some other coming of Christ, not yet come; for his coming in the Spirit T. D. owns not to be the end thereof; but where then is the mystery and inward and Spiritual Grace signified by the outward Sign? (so much talked of in your Catechisms) but its evident T. D. is ignorant of the Mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ; and Cup of the new Testament in his Blood, which the outward Bread and Cup was but the sign and figure of; we oppose the Popish opinion of Transubstantiation.

And however, as to the *Corinthians* at that time, among them there was strife and division, contention and disorder, one being hungry, another drunk, another asleep; one being of *Paul*, another of *Apollo*, another of *Cephas*, which the Apostle reprov'd therein, as being carnal, walking as men, so that he could not speak unto them as unto Spiritual, but as unto Carnal, 1 Cor. 3. 11, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 30. Now supposing that wherein the Apostle might or did condescend to their low capacity, as not grown to that Spirituality, so as to see through the outward Shadows, this their Example was not to be a President, nor could it in Reason or Truth be enjoyned to all other that succeeded, who were come truly to know the glory of Christ's appearance in Spirit, and Spiritually to enjoy the Communion of the body and Blood of Christ, where none of these disorders aforesaid have any place.

Now *Paul* in his second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 13. 15. bids them, examine and prove themselves, saying, Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you except you are Reprobates; So here was the Bread he then referred them to, which indeed was always the intent and end of his Labour and Travel, to bring those that were weak to a Living and Spiritual sence even of this

this Spiritual Bread; however because of their weakness, and low capacity he might condescend unto them, as in some things he did.

And whereas T. D. pleading for his Ordinances, as before; saith, Pag. 72. *They do not cease as to our need of them, because it is not to be supposed, consistent with Christ's Wisdom to continue an obligation upon us to the use of a means, when the end is obtained; viz. the appearance of Christ within, that is a full appearance or state of Perfection* (saith he) *but we having proved that there is no such state attainable in this life; then if those Ordinances oblige till we be arrived at perfection, they oblige, and so are of use during term of life.*

*Ans.* Where observe, first, however he hath granted that they are not obliging where the end is attained, or not continued by Christ as an obligation where this his appearance is Witnessed which brings to a state of Perfection. Secondly, T. D. having not proved that such a state is not attainable on this side the Grave, but the contrary being proved before against him and all his Brethren sinfull Pleas, Doctrines and Arguments for Sin and Imperfection in this life; therefore this Spiritual appearance of Christ brings man beyond all mens Traditions and outward Ordinances, (so called) and indeed who do know a beginning in the Spirit ought to wait for this Spiritual Appearance and Coming of Christ according to the Spirit's direction which is most perfect, and not to turn back again into the Types, Shaddows and Figures, nor into the weak and beggerly Elements of the World, not yet *Galat. 3. 4. Chapters.* subject themselves to mens Traditions, carnal Commandments, imposed Doctrines and Precepts, but to wait upon God in Spirit, to serve and worship him in the newness of the Spirit, that thereby they may know the Spiritual Washing, the Baptism into Christ's Death, and be Baptized by the one Spirit into one Body, and so come into the House of God, and to feed at his Table, and partake of the Living Bread which comes down from Heaven, and to drink of the Fruit of the Vine with Christ in his Fathers Kingdom, which Kingdom he promised to his Disciples should come with Power even in their Age, or before some of them that stood by should taste of death, *Mark 9. 1. Luke 9. 27.*

And as for T. D's saying, *The Apostle calls the Doctrine of Baptism a Foundation;* (these are not the Apostles words, neither did

he teach Sprinkling Infants) for, saith he, *but leaving the Principles (or beginning of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto Perfection, not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead works, and of Faith towards God, and the Doctrine of Baptisms, &c.*

Now if Perfection which was the end of those Baptisms was the thing they were to go on unto, as he exhorted; surely, then it was attainable; for the Apostles exhortation was in the Faith, and did not oppose Perfection, as T. D. erroneously hath done, but directed and led them forward out off and beyond the Shaddows and Figures unto the Substance, and preached to present men perfect in Christ.

Of the Resurrection. And whereas T. D. hath charged us yet further with a great Error, which is, that there is no Resurrection from the Dead; and to prove us guilty hereof, he mentioneth a Letter of one R. Turner, (which Letter I have not seen, nor do I know the man) as also G. W. in his late Answer to William Burnet; and G. F. junior in his Books bound up together.

Ans. How apparently T. D. hath belyed, slandered, and abused us, in accusing so positively that we hold there is no Resurrection from the Dead, is evident in many printed Books of ours; and he hath neither mentioned my words, nor G. F.'s; I say his slander and false accusation herein against me in particular may be plainly detected out of that very Book of my own, wherein Pag. 67. I have expressed these very words, *But the Resurrection according to the Scriptures of Truth, and Testimonies of Christ and the Apostles we do believe and own, as Recorded in John 5. 21, 24, 25, 28, 29. and Chap. 11, 25. Matth. 22, 30, 31, 32. 1 Cor. 15: 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. and so on 2 Cor. 5. 1. Many other places might be cited.* These very words and Scriptures are thus set down in my Answer to William Burnet, after which are some passages of a Dispute I had upon the same subject with that busie (yet sorry) Contender Matthew Cuffin the Baptist; whose impertinencies and ignorance at the Dispute was fully manifested, as others of his Brethrens have been when they have appeared in the same unprofitable work against us.

And as concerning what G. F. the younger saith (in his Books collected) clears him also from T. Danson's impudent slander of holding there is no Resurrection from the Dead; for G. F. affirmeth the contrary in pag. 209, 210. in these very words, 'Touching the Resur-



' Resurrection, its a Mystery which the carnal mind can never com-  
 ' prehend, but they that come to witness a part in Christ Jesus the  
 ' Light of Life, they in his Light may come to perceive the Mys-  
 ' tery of the Resurrection; but if Truth can be received and un-  
 ' derstood, then it will appear that I do not deny the Resurrection;  
 ' for I do verily believe that the Hour is coming, in which all that  
 ' are in the Graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall  
 ' come forth; they that have done good unto the Resurrection of  
 ' Life, and they that have done evil unto the Resurrection of  
 ' Condemnation; but to Fools that say that this Body of natural  
 ' Flesh and Bones shall be raised; I say, that body *1 Cor. 15. 35,*  
 ' which is sown is not that body that shall be, but *36, 37, 38.*  
 ' God giveth a body as it pleaseth him, yet to every  
 ' Seed its own body. Thus saith G. F. junior; by all which T. D.  
 his slander is detected; and his false spirit discovered, as not fit to  
 meddle with the Mysteries of God, which are out of his sight and  
 reach. God will sweep away the refuse of Lyes and Lyars.

---

Some

---

Some Observations upon John Owen's  
Book, [Entituled, A Declaration, &c.]  
including a brief Answer and Reply to  
the same.

**A**S We the People of God, called Quakers, are but little concerned in *John Owen's* Declaration, we need concern our selves the less; and let them that are chiefly concerned in his Accusations make him answer. But in that he hath in some few places hinted, and falsely insinuated against us as being one with the *Socinians*, (as he calls them) or seduced into Socinianism: Lest any should give credit to these and such like insinuations, and thereby be prejudiced against us, or the Truth professed by us, meerly upon *John Owen's* overly Reports, I judge it meet a little to appear in Truth's Vindication, and our clearness in answer to some particulars in his Book.

As first, where in his Preface Pag. 6. he saith, *There is now a visible accession made by that sort of People whom men will call Quakers, from their departure from the first erection of their Way long since deserted by them.*

*Ans.* We have not made any accession contrary to the Truth first received by us; nor have we deserted its Way, which so long since the Lord God by his Power gathered us into out of the corrupt Wayes, Inventions, Traditions, and false Worshipps of the World, to worship him in the Spirit and in the Truth, wherein we have been gathered to be a peculiar people to God, being delivered from the many Sects, Wayes, and Professions set up since the dayes of the Apostles.

As to *Socinianism*, as he calls it, we are neither Discipled in it, nor Baptized into *Socinus* his name, neither do we own him for our  
Author

Author or Patern in those things which we Believe and Testifie; nor yet do we own several Principles which *John Owen* relates, as being from *Socius*, and principally that of *Christ's being* (God, but) *not the Most High God*, pag. 34, 53. It was never our Principle; for though we do confess to his condescension, humility and Suffering in the dayes of his Flesh, wherein he appeared in the form of a Servant, being made in fashion as a man; but his being in the form of God, in the Divine Nature of God, wherein he was equal with God, and being glorified with the same glory he had with the Father before the World began, and his being God over all blessed for ever; these things we professed and believed in the beginning, and do the same still, it never being in our hearts, in the least, to oppose or desert them; therefore, as to the *Conjunction* 7. O. tell of *between both these sorts of men in opposition to the holy Trinity, with the Person and Grace of Christ*.

Herein he hath charged a double falsehood upon us; first, such a Conjunction and Opposition either to the Person or Grace of Christ which we absolutely deny; neither is our opposing of mens corrupt meanings of Scripture and invented names and terms put upon the Deity any opposition either against God, Christ, or Spirit, nor yet against the Grace or Love of either.

J. O. Pag. 6. *However they may seem in sundry things as yet to look divers ways, yet like Sampson's Foxes, they are knis together by the tayl in these firebrand Opinions, and joyntly endeavour to consume the standing Corn of the Church of God, and their joynt management of their business of late, &c.*

Ans. I suppose he intends *Quakers* and *Socinians*, wherein both his Accusation and Comparison are false and scornfull, for there's no such conjunction, nor joynt endeavours between them; neither ever was it the *Quakers* intent or principle, in the least, to endeavour to consume the standing Corn of God's Church, (as we injuriously are accused) but such vain and false imaginations, corruptions and perverting Scripture, as J. O. and his Brethren are guilty of, which have no growth nor reception in the Church of God; for his Church is in him, and led by his Spirit into all Truth, which no Lye nor Deceit have any part in. Besides, as for *Sampson's* Foxes, they were not set to destroy the Corn of the Church or Is-

rail,

vari, but of the *Philistines*; neither can we believe that the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* are the true Church, till we see better Fruit appear among them then is yet: for look into their Assemblies, and see what pride and vanity they are gotten into in their apparel; behold also, how gaudy in their habits their women are; and what an example of pride and pomp they shew to the profane, to the shame of their profession; certainly God hath yet Viols of Wrath unemptied, to pour down upon that proud and persecuting Spirit, which hath so much shewed it self in many of them.

But what he means by those words *holy Trinity*, he further explains in pag. 26, 27. in these words, viz. Now the sum of the Revelation in these terms, is, that God is one, that this one God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that the Father is the Father of the Son, and the Son the Son of the Father; and the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Father and of the Son: Now had this Doctor Owen and his Brethren but kept to these, and such like expressions, and have left out their unscriptural scholastick terms and distinctions about Trinity; *distinct Substances* and *Personalities*, we should not need to have had such controversies with any of them about them, but have taken their confession that God is one, and that Father Son and holy Ghost are God; and that the Father is Father of the Son, and the Son the Son of the Father, &c. according to this great Doctors Revelation, who pretends very much to Scripture, and makes many large Repetitions of Scripture to prove his matter, counting them the Revelation; but then being again not willing to keep to the terms, expressions and phrases of Scripture, but writes his own conceivings, senses and meanings, as men of his Coat and Fraternity use to do; as in Pag. 31. he pleads for making use of other words expressions and phrases, that neither are literally nor formally contained in Scripture, and so makes use of his conceptions and apprehensions of what is contained therein, see pag. 30, 31.

But then again another while he saith, Let us nakedly attend to what the Scripture asserts, as in pag. 42. And in pag. 110. he tells us of manifesting what was revealed expressly in Scripture concerning God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so that many times he would make people believe, as if he would nakedly and, exactly keep to the Scriptures; but then at other times his notions, conceptions, meanings, and odd invented terms must be put upon them, and men

men must either confess to those, or else be liable to his and his Brethrens censures of being *Socinians, Hereticks, Blasphemers*, and what not? And though he hath appeared a little smoother than his Brother *Tho. Vincent* hath done in his railing Pamphlet, yet he hath wronged us by his false insinuations against us, as if we denied the Divinity of Christ, and deserted our former Principles; also he hath represented us as being in conjunction with those whom he accuseth of opposing or denying the oneness of the Deity, and the Grace of Christ, or the Father, Son, and holy Ghost to be God, which we are not at all concerned in, nor guilty of; and our Books and Writings now, and from the very beginning evince the contrary.

But then in Pag. 129. he confesseth, *That the objections these men principally insist upon, are merely against the explanations we use of this Doctrine, and not against the primitive Revelation of it, which is the principal object of our Faith &c.*

Now if by *these men* he intends us, called Quakers, as is apparent he doth by his present discourse, he hath then very much cleared us from other of his and his Brethrens Accusations, and thereby hath also plainly contradicted both himself and them; for here our objections are merely against their explanations, and not against the primitive Revelation or principal object of Faith; so whilst the Revelation which is according to the Scriptures, and the principal object of Faith is not objected against, but owned and professed by us according to the Scripture, it is very unjust and injurious either in him or his Brethren to insinuate against us, as if we denied either the Divinity of Christ or the holy Spirit; though as to their distinctions about *Personalities, Substances, Modalities*, and the like invented terms and names which they put upon the Deity we must needs except against as not scriptural, nor proceeding from any naked attention to what the Scripture asserts, (which *J. O.* doth but pretend to) but from mens conceptions and traditions which are upheld by the wisdom which this world teacheth, and not that which the Holy Ghost teacheth.

And then in Pag. 89. he goes to accuse and vilifie us in these words; viz. *Our Quakers for a long time hovered up and down like a swarm of Flies, with a confused noise and humming.* (what falshood and scorn is here for such a Doctor to express) *begin now to settle in the*

*Opinions lately by them declared for ; (this is a false insinuation again) what their thoughts will fall to be concerning the holy Ghost when they shall be consented to speak intelligibly and according to the usage of other men, or the pattern of Scripture, the great rule of speaking or treating about spiritual things, I know not, and I am uncertain whether they do themselves or no. Thus far J. Owen.*

To which I say, in the first of these expressions he hath scornfully and falsely accused us, as also with beginning now to settle in Opinions, for we are neither so beginning, nor so to begin, but are settled in the Truth out of and above mens invented Opinions, about which are so many Divisions and Sects among them; but if by *Opinion* he intends *Socinianism*, (as he calls and represents it) his own testimony shall testify against him as a false Accuser of us herein, as in pag. 129. where he confesseth our objections to be merely against the explanation they use, and not against the primitive Revelation of it; so then we are not guilty of such Opinions, as either deny the Divinity of Christ, or that tends to lessen him in any respect or offices relating to man's Salvation; for our desire is, and our endeavour hath been the exaltation of his Name, Power and Glory over all; neither have we been hovering, nor in confusion, as falsely he hath represented us; and if he knows not what our thoughts will fall into concerning the Holy Ghost, but is uncertain whether we do our selves or no, he should therefore have been silent of accusing or reviling us, as he hath done, because it appears it is in his ignorance and uncertainty that he hath thus vilified us, and insinuated against us; he should have received a better information and knowledge of us before he had thus reviled us; and not to have gone and bespattered and vilified a whole Body of People, to render them odious from his own uncertain thoughts of them; for he would not be so dealt by himself: and the Reader may take notice that a great part of his Book, (wherein he goes about to prove the Divinity or Deity of Christ and the Holy Ghost) in which he appears as one opposing some great Enemies, (among whom we are numbred) we are unconcerned therein, having never denied Christ's Divinity; and if his own testimony may be of any value, we are cleared by it (as before) in pag. 129. Alas! poor man, J. O. has missed his mark in shooting thus uncertainly, and at random against the *Quakers*.



And where he adds touching the Holy Ghost, *Whether he may be the Light within them, or an infallible affluus, is uncertain.*

Though it be uncertain to *J. Q.* it is certain to us that have the Testimony and evidence of the holy Spirit in us, which gives us both Life, Light and Power, and we know him to be infallible, how deridingly soever he speaks of it, as also according to the precious Promises of God which hereby we know in a large measure the fulfilling of; we experience Christ to be in us, and in that the Father *Word and Spirit* are confessed to be one Power, Wisdom and Love, and to be of one *Divine Substance, Nature and Essence*; this we neither do nor ever did deny: and God is in his People, and dwells in them, and walks in them, and the Spirit is sent into our hearts; so they are not divided, distinct and separate persons, &c. *as may be read in John 17. 21, to the end, where Christ said, that they may all be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the World may believe that thou hast sent me; and the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, &c.* And God said, *Let us make man in our own Image after our likeness*, Gen. 1. 26. Now, if by *us*, here is intended Father, Son and Holy Ghost (which is called *Trinity*) then it follows that he was made in the likeness of all three, and yet we do not read that God did consist in three distinct Persons, nor that man was made in the Image of three Persons, nor yet that three distinct and separate persons dwelt in him, though God did promise after the Fall to dwell in his people: and he and his Son and Spirit we do really own, confess to, and have a living sence and experience of to our Souls Comfort and everlasting peace; So when we cannot well represent, nor accept of mens invented terms put upon the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, it is unreasonable and injurious to accuse us with opposing any of them, or denying their Divinity, and the Unity of the Deity.

And where *John Owen* in pag. 91, 92. to prove the Holy Ghost a Person, and an existing Substance, which he calls also a distinct and divine Person, he quotes many Scriptures, as Gen. 1. 2. the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; Psalm 33. 6. by the Word of the Lord the Heavens were made, and all the Host of them by the Spirit of his Mouth; these, with many he urgeth for

proof of the Personallity of the Holy Ghost. So according to his Principles and terms which he puts upon the Holy Ghost (as a distinct Person, &c.) and according to J. O.'s meaning we must read the Scriptures thus, the [Person] of God moved upon the face of the Waters: By the [Person] of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the [Person] of his mouth: and so likewise upon Job 26. 13. by his [Person] he hath garnished the Heavens, and in like manner upon the rest of the Scriptures he bringeth in this case: Now let the Reader judge whether such a meaning & alteration put upon the Scriptures doth either look clear, or sound well; and whether it be not a corrupting Scripture, and addition, contrary to the plain innocent Language thereof; and if such corruption and alteration upon Scripture may be admitted of, how are they the only Rule, or great Rule of speaking and treating about spiritual things? J. Owen and his Brethren had better refer people to the Scriptures, and leave them to a naked attention to what Scripture asserts, rather than thus to pervert them, or puzzle and darken peoples minds with their humane inventions, and Scholastick terms imposed in the time of Apostacy and Popery.

And concerning the Son of God, and some accounting him the Light within men; this J. O. numbers among the monstrous imaginations, pag. 87.

Wherein he hath not only struck at us who testifie to Christ, as the Light of the World, that lighteth every man, and as being in the true Believers both their Light, Life and Salvation; but also J. O. hath herein opposed both the former Saints and Scriptures of Truth, who testified unto Christ the Light as we do; as also he owned himself, to be come a light into the World, and to be in his Followers, He that is with you shall be in you; In them and they in me, &c.

Pag. 103. J. O. queries how can the Power of God, or a quality be said to be sent, to be given, to be bestowed on men?

Ans. Yes, very well it may be so said, Christ gave them power to become the Sons of God, who believed on his Name; and was not this God's Power? had Christ any thing but what was Gods? and the Saints knew the Power of God to work mightily in them; so that this Doctor hath shewed himself very ignorant of the Power of God, and its work, which doth beget and restore man into the Image, Righteousness and true Holiness of God,

God, and this is given and bestowed on such as believe in the Light within, the Light of the Divine Power of God, which giveth unto us all things appertaining to Life and Godliness.

And now touching the distinctions of Persons or Personal Substances in God, J. O. saith pag. 114. *The distinct apprehension of them, and their accurate expression is not necessary unto Faith, as it is our Guide, &c. nor are those brief explanations before mentioned so proposed as to be placed immediately in the same rank or order with the original Revelations.*

*Ans.* If they be not necessary unto Faith, nor yet to be placed in the order with Revelations, (meaning Scripture) why then are these men so strict in going about to impose their terms, expressions and explications which they have not in the Scripture upon peoples Faith and Conscience, as if it were a matter of damnation not to receive a Faith concerning God under their traditional notions and terms: However we believe what the Scriptures saith both of God, Christ and holy Spirit, who are one; laying aside all these mens invented confused amusing Sophistry, Cavils, and their darkening terms (as distinct and separate Personalities, Substances, Subsistances, Modalities, &c. of which they themselves are guilty, though J. O. accuseth others therewith pag. 116.

And whilst these pretended accurate expressions are not necessary unto Faith, why doth J. O. press them as proper expressions of what is revealed to encrease our light? pag. 115.

What apparent contradiction is this; not necessary unto Faith, as our Guide, and yet proper to encrease our light, as if the encrease of light had not a necessary relation unto both Faith as Guide and Principle, both in and unto religious worship; but to be sure that instead of encreasing light, their dark invented scholastick Heathenish and Popish terms have encreased much darkness in the minds of people, and kept many in great ignorance both of God and the mystery of godliness.

And whereas J. O. gives order or instruction, *that they that deny or oppose their explications, are to be required positively to deny or disapprove the oneness of the Deity, or to prove that the Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost are not God, before they be allowed to speak one word against the manner of the explication,* pag. 115.

*Ans.* A very unreasonable impolition and requiring, to require

quire any to deny the oneness of the Deity, or to prove the Father Son or Holy Ghost not to be God, because they may except against such invented explications as J. O. and his Brethren have brought out of their Heathenish Storehouses, and Chambers of Imaginary; and hath not he herein imposed upon the Objecters? and begged the question, taking it as granted that their explications are as true as the oneness of the Deity, or as true as that the Father Son and Holy Ghost are God, as if he had told us it is all one, as true that they are *distinct severed Persons*, as it is that they are God; which it is not: we have not ground to believe their explications herein to be equal; for the Unity of the Godhead or Divinity of Christ (or his Spirit) we never denied nor scrupled; Therefore for J. O. to require any that except against their terms and inventions positively, to deny the Unity of the Deity, is both sad Doctrine and unreasonableness, as also shews an imperious lord-ing spirit; though its probable among the Independants and Professors he can make a shew of more humility then he did formerly; for he now wants *Cromwel* to promote him.

However, he and others of his Fraternity might by this time have in reality learned more lowliness and humility, then yet appears in them towards such as cannot be screwed up to their way and method of expressing the Invisible things of God, which are Heavenly, Divine and Spiritual, as his being and properties are absolutely above the comprehension of J. O's reason, as is confessed pag. 128. *We cannot by searching find out God, we cannot find out the Almighty to perfection*: And yet vain man would be wise and imploy his natural reason and fallen wisdom, both to find, and set out God, to evince him and his things unto the natural reason of others which still falls short both of any true knowledge and spiritual understanding; for vain by nature is every man, and ignorant of God. It is the spiritually minded who are begotten to God, who are spiritually and immediately taught by his Spirit, that have a true and spiritual understanding of Divine Matters and Mysteries.

Pag. 118. J. O. *Every person hath distinctly its own Substance,* [But then in contradiction he adds] *for the one Substance of the Deity is the Substance of each Person; but each Person hath not its own distinct Substance*

Reply, A strange Riddle and invention, that each person hath distinctly

distinctly its own Substance, and yet not its own distinct Substance; what Scripture hath he for this Critick and nice distinction? how is a person then an individual Substance of a rational nature, that is not upheld by another, if it hath not its own distinct Substance, whilst yet it hath distinctly its own Substance? but the Divine Substance of the Deity of the Father, the Word, and Spirit is but one, as often hath been granted; so then the Holy Ghost, though confessed to be a *Substance*, pag. 101. yet, I say, not a Personal Substance distinct from the Father and the Son, as there is ignorantly asserted.

But then J. O. to tell us pag. 118. *That all Divine properties, such as to be infinite is, belong not to the Persons, on the account of their Personality, but of their nature, &c.*

*Observe.* Then it appears they are not three Infinite Persons, but one Infinite God; and yet those Persons are the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; were it not both Blasphemy and contradiction to say they are finite; and what better have our Opposers said? but at other times they are Eternal; God Eternal, the Eternal Son and Eternal Spirit; and thus they wheel about, and say and unsay.

*Answer.* It were better for them nakedly to apply themselves to the plain Language of Scripture, and keep to it, to lay aside and avoid confusion, and absurdities about distinct finite personalities, which the Scripture does not put upon the Infinite God, in whom there is neither finiteness nor variableness. I am God, I change not, saith he; the Lord is one, and his name one; from Everlasting to Everlasting he is God unchangeable, And the Father Son and Holy Ghost being one Divine Infinite Substance, are one Infinite God. Away with your vain babbling, and invented erroneous distinctions of finite Persons in him who is infinite; you are not worthy therein to talk of God, nor to take his holy, precious and pure Name in your mouths, who are in your sins and pollutions, corrupting yourselves in your carnal conceptions and imaginations about those things that you know not; who are gone a whoring after humane inventions; invented words, names, terms and distinctions, such as neither the Holy Ghost, nor the Scriptures ever taught you.

Pag. 117. And as for them that will keep to their *Cavils* and *Sophisms*

*Sophisms* about terms and expressions; I know not who *J. O.* may intend hereby; but if he intend us, called *Quakers*, because we do not own, but oppose his and their dark unscriptural terms and expressions, which darken both counsel and knowledge, we do reject his Accusation and Charge herein, for Cavils and Sophisms are rather his and his Brethrens, who have been trained up in Sophistry and School-craft, in order to be furnished to a Trade of Preaching, to make a Trade of the Scriptures, corrupting them by their dark meanings, and School-terms, and Philosophick distinctions, by which poor people have been kept even learning, that they might be always paying them.

Pag. 117. But then *J. O.* addeth against such as he supposeth will keep to their Cavills and Sophisms, *That all further debate or conference with them, may justly, and ought both conscientiously and rationally to be refused and rejected.*

*Reply*, If herein he may intend us, as its probably he may, as well as others among whom he has numbred us (though unrighteously) as his debating or conference is of little value or esteem with us, whilst it proceeds neither from a sence of God's Divine Power, nor from any Living experience of God, or his work within, but from humane inventions and traditions: So *J. O.* and his Brethrens work in these matters, whether they go on in it, or stop from further debate, it will be of very little weight to us, since we see to the far end of their subtilty, and beyond their spirits and confusion; however, *J. O.* laying it as their duty not to debate any further with such as he censures, (as before) he hath brought himself, and those that own him under a Law and Limitation, that if they further contend with us, they must either not accuse us with Cavills and Sophisms, or else not debate nor contend any further with us; for if they do so accuse and censure us, and yet further debate or contend with us, they transgress their own Law, so strictly here urged by *J. O.* and by the same reason, when he and they are found guilty of Cavils and Sophisms, may not others as much slight him and them thereby? But however he or they judge or censure us, I hope we shall not be backward nor negligent to vindicate the Truth, and clear our innocency from reproaches and scandals of men of perverse and envious spirits, when we have occasion given us thereby.

*J. O.* *These sacred Mysteries of God and the Gospel, are not lightly to be made the subject of mens contest and disputations.*



*Obser.* It is very true, that sacred Mysteries of God and Gospel are not lightly, nor yet slightly to be made subjects of contests, nor yet ought they to be meddled with by light airy minds, nor by perverse and prejudiced spirits, which are apt to bring forth perverse disputes, as it is too common to men of corrupt minds, who are destitute of the Truth: But why then do *Presbyterian* Teachers give such occasion by their light and vain contests, confusions and contradictions to stir up the minds of people into such disputations about things which both they themselves are yet to seek in, and by which they do the more darken the Enquirers? J. O. should seriously review and examine his Bro. *Vincent* and *T. Danson* their contests in their late Pamphlets, and see how lightly and sordily they have contended, and how they have contradicted themselves; and whether such as they be fit Champions in the management of their Cause? it concerns them to pause upon their work, and examine it, and compare their Books together, for they have very palpably contradicted one another in divers passages of principle concernment; and if several of them write Pamphlets again against the Quakers, they had need to compare them very diligently, for otherwise, in all probability, they will contradict one another, as they have done, as is the nature of *Babel's Builders* so to do.

Pag. 150. J. O. For the term of Satisfaction, the right understanding of the word it self depends on some notions of Law, that as yet we need not take into consideration.

*Ans.* It appears J. O. and his Brethren's understanding of their Doctrine herein depends on notions of Law not yet taken into consideration, and not on any living experience of the Gospel of Gods Divine Power wherein the Righteousness of Faith is revealed, and the living and blessed effect of Christ's suffering and death; and here they bring us their notions instead of Gospel, so that what they tell us in this matter it is not from a saving knowledge or sense of the work of God in themselves, but notions received by tradition from one another, though they intermix many Scriptures among their notions, and therefore would have all go for Gospel that they divulge; but who knows the Power of God within, and the fellowship of Christ's Sufferings will own the Scriptures of Truth as we do, and not relie upon their uncertain notions, about which so much of their confusion and contradiction amongst themselves doth

appear, that little of their work can certainly be laid hold on, as with any confidence of their stability; howbeit, J. O. has in several things consented to the Truth in words which we do own, though we do not believe that he or his Brethren do experience the Life and Power of what they profess, as where J. O. Confesseth,

That God out of his infinite Goodness, Grace and Love to mankind sent his only Son to save and deliver them; viz. from their sins, and that this Love was the same in the Father and Son; and that Christ gave himself a Ransom for all, to be testified in due time, 1 Tim. 2. 6: And gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, Titim. 2. 14. And to finish Transgression, and to make an end of Sin; to make Reconciliation, to bring in Everlasting Righteousness, Dan. 9. 24. And that God had provided himself a Lamb for a Sacrifice; And God doth not pardon Sins freely, without requiring Faith, Repentance and Obedience in them that are pardoned; and it is certain that the prescribing of Faith and Repentance in and unto Sinners antecedently to their participation of it, &c. We are to be discharged upon Gods terms, and under a new obligation unto his Love, &c. Thus far J. O.

*Observe.* In all which observe that J. O. has confessed unto the Truth, much more then some of his Brethren.

For first, to the infinite Goodness of God, and his Love the same in Father and Son, which declares the freeness of both towards mankind, and their union therein for mans deliverance from Sin, Death and the Curse.

Secondly, That God sending his Son, was to save and deliver from Sin, to redeem us from all Iniquity: Its well if J. O. truly believes what he sayes herein; for his Brethren T. V. and T. D. have pleaded the contrary in their contending for Sin and Imperfection in all Believers term of Life.

Thirdly, Christ giving himself a ransom for all, to be testified of in due time; instead of *For All*, Presbyterians and Independants were wont to say, it was but for a few that he died, only for a certain select number, wherein they have denied the universal Love, and Grace of God in Christ to mankind.

Fourthly,

Fourthly His coming to finish Transgression, to make an end of Sin, and to bring in Everlasting Righteousness, is both beyond and contradicts their sinful Doctrine for sin and imperfection, and their notion of imputation of Christ's Righteousness to sinful persons, whilst they are not at all really partakers of Christ's Righteousness, Holiness or Purity in them, no more then Christ was guilty of sin, when he knew no sin, according to T. D's instance and erroneous Argument, for a proportion in that case.

Fifthly, And seeing that without Faith, Repentance and Obedience on the Creature's part, God doth not pardon sins freely, it appears it is not peoples bare application and belief of what Christ hath done and suffered for them that will free and acquit them, without the knowledge and sence of his Power which works living Faith and Repentance, and makes willing to obey the pure Law of God in the heart, and the new Covenant in the inward parts; for as J. O. confesseth, it would altogether unbecome the holy God to pardon Sinners that continue so to live and die in their sins, pag. 179. this is a truth which he and his Brethren had need to look to, that they be not found guilty both in Principle and in Practice, as namely both contending and preaching up a continuance in sin and imperfection all their dayes, as T. D. and T. V. hath done; and as its said by many, some of the Presbyterian Teachers do more of late revile the Quakers for holding Perfection and Freedom from Sin attainable in this life, and to perswade people against the belief of such a state more then they have done heretofore; wherein they work, as if they would hasten people to Hell and De-

struction, *But what a strange instance is that of J. O. that God cannot lie, he cannot deny himself, &c. to prove that he cannot freely pardon sin, &c. pag. 178. as if the one were as much contrary to his nature as the other, and yet upon Faith and Repentance (which are his gifts) he doth pardon his Creature man. Note also that J. O. to the Reader saith of his Authors, that many of them do expressly blame some of the School-men, as Aquinas Durandus Biel Tartaretus, for granting a possibility of pardon without satisfaction, as opening a way to the Socinian error; See here J. O's Authors, & great able learned defenders; how they censure and contradict one another, yet he would have men be wary how they censure them notwithstanding.*

struction, and do but strengthen the hands of the Evil-Doers, that they may not forsake their sins, by promising them life, as the false Prophets did, and promising them pardon and peace on the account of all being fully paid and satisfied for them, they living and dying in sin, or telling them that perfection is not attainable till after death, as namely, till the Resurrection, as T. D. and others of them have affirmed; but they had little need to preach up such Doctrine, for their Hearers and Followers are prone and apt enough to rush on in sin and transgression without their Leaders tutoring them in it; they had not need to drive them on to Hell and Destruction; the Devil can lead them fast enough thither, who continue Sinners, to live and die in their sins, wherein it does not become the holy God to pardon them, as is confessed.

And now touching your Explication, Declaration and Confession concerning the Terms and Conditions whereon Sinners may be interested in the Satisfaction made by Christ; J. O. saith pag. 167. *It may also be farther evinced that there is nothing asserted in them but what is excellently suited unto the common notions which mankind hath of God and his Righteousness, and that in their practice they answer the Light of Nature and common Reason exemplified in sundry instances among the Nations of the World.*

*Ans.* First it is to be observed that a great stress is laid upon these Explanations, Declarations or Confessions of yours, as relating to the terms and interest you claim in Christ's Satisfaction unto the determination of God's Will and Confirmation of Divine testimonies according to J. O's words, wherein no less then Salvation appears to be concerned; for without an interest in Christ and his Righteousness men cannot be saved. Secondly, Your Assertions herein being suited unto the common notions of mankind, and as answering the Light of Nature and common Reason (as it is called, and as J. O's words are) whether herein hath he not rendred this Light and common Reason, together with the common notions mankind hath of God, to be of a saving property, since it so suits those things wherein Salvation is so deeply concerned, according to J. O. but then if he does not reckon mens common Notions, Light or Reason which is natural to be saving (as indeed we do not believe that any thing natural, as of man in the Fall can save) then may we not reasonably look upon J. O. to have asserted and declared those things

things wherein Salvation is not concerned, or which we are not to look upon as answering that Light which is Spiritual and Saving, but only common Notions and natural Reason, whilst he and his Brethren keep not to plain Scripture Language, and but run into notions, terms distinctions, which they have by Tradition from men & mens inventions, more suttling common and corrupt reason then Divine Light. But and if the Light in men be Divine which manifests divine Revelations and Testimonies relating to Salvation, (such as J. O. would have us believe his matter to be grounded on) then it follows, that such a light is common or universal in mankind, and not only given to a few, nor natural, as it hath been often rendred by such as J. O. || and what doth this spiritual or divine Light teach concerning God and his Righteousness, but that he is to be feared, obeyed and honoured, and that all sin and iniquity should be forsaken, and God's Righteousness, Power and Image (which is Christ Jesus) lived in, obeyed and followed by man; for herein is God well pleased and satisfied in beholding his own Image and birth renewed and brought forth, which admits not of sin nor imperfection, much less of either pleading, contending, disputing or preaching for its continuance in all term of life; and this Light of Christ within (however any miscall it) is that which gives the knowledge of God's Love in Christ, and of the vertue and efficacy of his Suffering, and so of his Blood, and to eat of his flesh which is given for the Life of the World, wherein we partake of him, as the one Offering, at the Altar of God in his Sanctuary, which the carnal Professors, both among *Jews* and pretended Christians, were

and

*Who wish his Brethren were fully manifested and confuted by Sam. Fisher in his Book styled Rusticus, &c. never yet answered by them, nor like to be.*

and are ignorant of, and in this Light are we come to know and receive Christ, and reconciliation through his Death, and also the glory of God through him in whom we have received the Atonement, Peace and Union with the Father in the Son, which all you that either slight, oppose or deny this Light within, and say its but natural, are ignorant of, being but in your dark notions, natural apprehensions and conceivings, which you intermix with Scripture, so that the Dignity, Glory, Power and Vertue that is, and ever was in Christ, you do but talk of, without the real sence, discerning or enjoyment thereof; but every one that truly waits upon the Living God in his Light and Life within, whereby their minds and spirits being subjected unto his Will, and their hearts truly broken before him, such know the Ransom and Atonement which the Righteous and redeemed of the Lord knew and witnessed in all Ages, and have that to offer unto God, and such Sacrifices to present before him, wherein he behold of his own glory and beauty, and favours of his own vertue, which is truly acceptable and well pleasing unto him, who delighteth in his own Image, Seed and Royal Offspring, which none truly know but who come into the Light to receive Christ the promised Seed, which bruisheth the Serpents head, and to eat his Flesh, and drink his Blood, without which you have no Life in you, for all your talk and notions.

Pag. 185. *J. O. The Sacrifice denotes his Humane Nature; whence God is said to purchase his Church with his own Blood, Acts 20. 28. For he offered himself through the Eternal Spirit, there was the matter of the Sacrifice, which was the Humane Nature of Christ, Soul and Body, his Soul was made an Offering for Sin, Isa. 53. 10. his Death had the nature of a Sacrifice, &c.*

*Ans.*



*Ans.* These Passages are but darkly and confusedly expressed, as also we do not read in Scripture, that the Blood of God by which he purchased his Church, is ever called the Blood of the Humane Nature, nor that the Soul of Christ was the Humane Nature, or was put to death with the Body (for the wicked could not kill the Soul) though his Soul was made an Offering for sin, and he poured it out to death, (he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for Transgressors) but what death (and in what manner) was it is a mystery truly to know; for his Soul in his own being was Immortal, and the Nature of God is Divine, and therefore that the Blood of God should be of Humane (or earthly) nature appears inconsistent; and where doth the Scripture call the Blood of God Humane, or Humane Nature? Neither do we read that the Blood which beareth record in the Earth, and agrees in one with the Spirit (and which putgeth the Conscience, washeth and cleanseth the Believer in the Light from all sin) was ever called by the Apostles the blood of the Humane Nature; nor do we read that the Saints did eat and drink Flesh and Blood that was of a Humane Nature to receive Divine Life in them thereby; for the Water of Life, and Blood of Christ which are said to wash, sanctifie and justify, which agree in one with the Spirit, in those works and effects, we never read that they are called in Scripture by the name of *Humane Nature*; for the Spirit that quickens is divine; and it is the Spirit that gives Life, the Flesh profiteth nothing, *John 6.* And the Soul of Christ is Immortal, and did not die with the Body, though it is deemed as being of the Humane Nature with the Body, and so as of the Sacrifice in Suffering and Death; whereas, though his Soul was made an Offering for sin, he ha-  
ving

ving offered himself through the Eternal Spirit, yet his Soul or Spirit did not die || with the Body, though J. O. hath ignorantly made no distinction, but joyns both as being but Humane Nature, (which was Sacrificed to death) but yet its evident, that though his Soul and Spirit did not die with the Body, yet his Soul was offered for sin, for the sins of men were laid upon him, or did meet on him, as is frequently confessed; and so he suffered, and his Soul travelled under the burthen of them, so that his Sufferings were twofold, both inward and outward; and which were the greater, suppose ye, Professors? || and whether there be not a mystery to be known in the Sufferings, Death and Blood of Christ, beyond what could be seen or perceived with the carnal or outward eye, since that he is truly and savingly to be known after the Spirit, as the Apostles knew him, who experienced the Fellowship of his Sufferings, and a conformity unto his Death, and bare in their bodies the Dying of the Lord Jesus; that his Life might be manifest

|| For it was committed into the hands of the Father, and was that day in Paradise.

|| Whether his Soul's travel and suffering under the burthen of Mans Transgression, also, even till he was in an Agony, or his Body suffering under the violence of the wicked hands to death, and the shedding of his Blood, &c. And why hast thou forsaken me? Mat. 27.46. implies a deep suffering for Sinners under a cloud of Affliction; yet not the Infinite Wrath, or Eternal Death that's due to the Wicked who reject God's Love and good will that's rendered in Christ; we desire all may have as good an esteem of Christ in his Sufferings, as may be; but methinks you Professors do ascribe very mean honor to Christ and his Sufferings, who therein reckon him not innocent, but guilty of your sins; and therefore that he suffered the same Vengeance, or Vindictive Justice due to Reprobate Angels and Devils, is this the Dignity you confer upon Christ? Oh Miserable!

to be known in the Sufferings, Death and Blood of Christ, beyond what could be seen or perceived with the carnal or outward eye, since that he is truly and savingly to be known after the Spirit, as the Apostles knew him, who experienced the Fellowship of his Sufferings, and a conformity unto his Death, and bare in their bodies the Dying of the Lord Jesus; that his Life might be manifest

nifest in them: And Christ being touched with the feeling of their Infirmities, was able to relieve them that were tempted; and as *Paul* saith *Coloss. 1.* You that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your minds through wicked works; yet now hath he reconciled in the Body of his Flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable, and unproveable in his sight, if you continue in the Faith grounded and sealed, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel which you have heard, which is preached to every Creature which is under Heaven, whereof I *Paul* am made a Minister, who now rejoyce in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his Body sake, which is the Church, verse 21, 22, 23, 24: where mark, that the reconciled state was not that of enmity in their minds, and the end of this reconciliation through his Death, was to present them holy and unblameable, and unproveable in his sight, which does not admit of sin and imperfection term of life, nor yet of Professors arguing or pleading for sin as they do; and was there any of Christ's afflictions or sufferings then to be filled up in the Apostle for the sake of his Church? how do Professors resent this Doctrine? and what meaning will they give to it? can they say that Christ's suffering was all at an end or fulfilled at once whilst yet some was behind, to be filled up in his Saints, and that for his Churches sake? although still he was the one Offering, Ransom, and Sacrifice for sin, and was offered once for all, as both being opposed to, and ending the many Offerings under the Law, and consecrating a new and Living Way, and establishing an Everlasting Covenant of Life and Salvation; as also that in what he did and suffered, he set us an Example, bare

Testi-

74  
( )  
Testimony unto, and confirmed the Truth; this *J. O.* confesseth page 199. And as to his being a perfect High Priest, and discharging the Office thereof, and all other the Father required of him, these we never opposed nor went about to slight or lessen, as some injuriously represented us.

Neither would we have any unreverent and slighty Contests entertained on any hand about the Sufferings, Afflictions and Death of Christ, in the least, to lessen or undervalue them; nor yet ought you to meddle and tamper about either God, Christ, or Holy Spirit, or about the Suffering and Sacrifice of Christ with your pitifull sorry confused School-terms and distinctions, and beggerly scraps of mens Traditions and Rudiments of the World, &c. wherein you have laboured more to fill your heads with airy notions, invented words, and brain knowledge, rather then your hearts and souls with a saving Knowledge, and experimental sence and feeling of the Life and Power of Godliness, or of the Vertue and Efficacy of Christ Jesus, and his Reconciliation as the one Offering and Sacrifice which puts away sin, and whose Blood both remits and cleanseth from all iniquity: But to evade these blessed Effects, which are only known to them that walk in the Light, 1 *John* 1. 7. many of you Professors have found out a very easie way and nation of all being fully satisfied and payed for you, both for sins past, present, and to come, and of all being suffered and perfectly obeyed for you by Christ in your stead; (though you deny his dying and being a Propitiation for all men in the whole World) so that you can plead and wrangle for sin, imperfection and body of sin all your life, and say Christ hath fully payed all, and perfectly obeyed for you; as also you can easily eyade or refuse

( )  
refuse to suffer either with him, or for him; if but a little Storm, Trial or Persecution doth arise, you and your Leaders can secure your selves, and creep into corners, though now you can make a shew and bluster in this time of calm; and some of you make a boasting and insulting against W. P. and a hidious reviling of him now he is in suffering, and you at liberty, thinking probably that you may get your selves some credit and repute with those in power by your railing Pamphlets which you bring out one after another, like cowardly base spirited men, so many to go to trample upon a man, that is already underfoot, as to the outward man, in regard of his confinement, which some report that some of you *Presbyterians* were the Instigators and occasion of; (by such invective Clamours and Complaints, as some of you are accustomed to) clear your selves as well as you can; but yet withal you do but befool your selves in so many of you going to war against, and reproaching a poor man in Prison. (who freely offered up himself, to suffer which the most of you would be loath

|| For if but a little Storm or Persecution comes to try you, its probable the Back-doors, Back-ways, Closets, Cole-holes, Garrets or Cock-lofts, with the Back-leads, &c. may stand you, Professors, in some stead, as they have done many of you; otherwise, if there be no such By-ways to make an escape, and run away; the Table spread with Victuals, or Beer and Tobacco may

to do) || for by that your so great stir and noise you make against him, you render him (how mean soever he be in himself) such a potent Antagonist, (contrary to your many slighty and scornfull Characters of him, in your Books) that you make many moderate

moderate people the more enquire after him, and to have the better conception of him because of your eminency and openness, but such who wait upon the Lord, and in his Light stand still can see beyond you all, and your spirits and work, which the day hath declared.

### More Errors escaped the Press.

IN the Epistle, Page 2. Line 12, for *agree in*, read *are*. p. 23. l. 2. blot out. l. 23. for *for*, r. *in*. p. 23. l. 10. r. *produced*. l. 35. for *in*, r. *in*. In the Answer to T. V. p. 65. l. 1. blot out *that*. In the Answer to T. D. p. 3. l. 24. for *gists*, r. *gists*. p. 5. l. 18. for *in*, r. *in*. p. 7. l. 5. for *is*, r. *is*. l. 11. for *by*, r. *high*. p. 9. l. 10. for *and all*, r. *as all*. p. 12. l. 2. for *be*, r. *the*. p. 17. l. last, r. *we are*. p. 18. l. 35. for *on end*, r. *on end*. p. 19. l. 1. r. *anoints*. l. 12. r. *onwards*. p. 21. l. 27. r. *It is in Christ*. p. 27. l. 6. r. *deserving*. p. 39. l. 35. for *whether*, r. *whether*. p. 45. at l. 26, 27. the Reader may add, or understand, [*as given by divine Inspiration, not mens fallable Judgements and Mistakes upon them*] p. 49. l. 17. (*in the church*) for *and*, r. *or*. p. 55. l. 18. dele *which*. p. 73. l. 7. (in the Appendix) r. *principal*. p. 74. l. 51. for *T. V.*, r. *T. D.* p. 76. l. 16. dele *there*. p. 77. l. 12. for *in*, r. *in*. p. 81. l. 16. dele *and*.

Sometimes such defects have escaped, as misplacing *hark* for *have*, *dosh* for *do*, *was* for *were*, *are* for *is*, *is* for *they*, *saith* for *say* [and so on the contrary.] Such are not material faults to any, but such as are critical, who do not soberly weigh the intent of the matter.



## An APPENDIX:

Wherein are some of the manifest Contradictions of *Thomas Vincent*, *William Maddox*, *Thomas Danſon*, and *John Owen*; both to themselves, and one against another: With brief *Animadversions* or *Observations* upon their *Contradictions*, which are about Principle Matters.

### I. Touching their distinction of Three Persons.

W. M. **I** *Am sure from the Scriptures, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being of an infinite Nature, are three Persons (three incrated persons) subsistences, or manner of beings, pag. 16, 17, 18, 19.*

Contrad. T. V. (In Contradiction to his Brother Maddox) saith, *Infiniteness is not applicable to the Subsistence, it cannot be properly ascribed to the Personality, though there be three distinct Personalities, to which Infiniteness is ascribed, pag. 45.*

Obs. See here is as much inconsistency between these two, as between infinite and finite; one making their being of an infinite Nature, a proof or reason of their distinct Personalities or Subsistencies; And the other saith, Infiniteness is not applicable, nor properly ascribed to them; what gross contradiction and blasphemous stuff is here!

W. M. *Each of these three persons, is God; his subsistence is his manner of being in the Relative property of the Father (and so he speaks of the Son and Holy Ghost) pag. 18, 19.*

*Contr. T.V. It is improper to say, that either of the persons, in regard of their personality or subsistence, are finite or infinite, pag. 46.*

*Obj. This latter Contradiction then would have neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost to be either finite or infinite; what gross nonsense and apparent Contradictions are these!*

*Contr. T.V. Christ is the Eternal Son of God by Eternal Generation, pag. 36, 47.*

*Obj. He is now the Eternal Son of God, before not infinite; but—again neither finite nor infinite in his Personality, and yet the Eternal Son of God; what mad distracted blasphemous work is this these men do make with their vain babbling!*

*T.V. They are not three substances, &c. therefore three persons, p. 13.*

*Contr. T.D. The usual definition of person, is an individual substance of a rational Nature, which is neither the part of another, nor upheld by another: which Aquinas defends, Sum Pat. 1. 9. 29. art. 2. a man, we call a person, &c. pag. 1, 2.*

*Obj. See again, how apparently these two Brethren contradict one another, one saying a person is an individual substance, &c. yet the other saith: They are not three substances, therefore three persons (whereas it follows) therefore not three persons.*

*Contr. J.O. We must acknowledge the Holy Ghost to be a substance, a person, God; yet distinct from the Father and the Son, pag. 101.—a personal subsistence, pag. 114.*

*Obj. Where note, that this Doctor Contradicts T.V. his saying they are not three substances; as also that he seems to make both substance, person, and subsistence to intend all one thing, contrary to T.V. again. But these words [a Person, God, yet distinct from the Father and Son] I cannot make sense of, though they are from a Doctor, for God is not a Person distinct from himself.*

*W.M. I called them three Hee's, to try if you would own the Deity of Christ, &c. according to the Scriptures: we call them Persons, or Hee's, in respect of their manner of Subsistence, pag. 18, 20.*

*Contrad. T.V. The word Person cannot properly be attributed to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, because they do not subsist in a several and distinct Nature of the same kind; for if each of them had a several and not one individual Nature, then they should not be only three Persons, but three Gods; Synopsis, pag. 3.*

*Obj.*

*Obs.* It's very evident here, that *Thomas Danson* has Contradicted both himself, and the rest of his Brethren, seeing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost cannot properly be called Persons.

*W.M.* (saith) His comparing the three incarnate persons to three Apostles, Paul, Peter, and John, is blasphemy, pag. 20.

*Contr. T.D.* A man we call a person, a person is intire of it self, pag. 2. if Peter, James, and John, each person be man, &c. — Take man here not for a person, but the Nature, as we do God, and is evident, that we mean no more than the name Man may be attributed to Peter, James, and John, pag. 12. David was a man, and Solomon was a man, they two were in a third thing, &c. pag. 14, 15.

See his shuffle here, for neither Nature nor Man simply can be called Three distinct separate Persons, as Peter, James, and John were; and as they say, the Father, Word, and Spirit, are.

*Obs.* What less do their own distinctions and comparisons concerning them amount to, than to Three Apostles, or men? (that is each intire of himself a Person is, *T.D.* saith) who hath apparently spoyled his own and his Brethrens Cause.

*T.V.* The Trinity of Persons, — the first in the second, and the second in the first, and both in the third, pag. 25.

*Contr. T.D.* A Person notes some one intire with reason and understanding, which is several and distinct by himself from another, p. 2. (and in the Dispute) (they are three distinct and separate Persons in the Deity) — A person is intire of it self, &c.

*Obs.* If the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, be in each other, and so inseparable, then not three distinct (nor separate) Persons, neither can one be several by himself from another.

*T.V.* That the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, are three persons, pag. 13. is to be found in the Scriptures, God hath revealed it in his Word, — the Scriptures hath revealed, that there are three distinct persons in one Divine Essence, pag. 26. Is Scripture truth, pag. 4. great truth.

*Contr. T.V.* In this Mystery of the Trinity we must exercise our Faith; Though we cannot clear it to our selves by Demonstration (Reason cannot demonstrate it unto us, pag. 36.) 'tis such a Mystery that doth exceed the most enlighten'd and clear-sighted Christians.

Contr. T.D. For Person, Aquinas defends, — I chuse to borrow that of the Learned Wotton, — the Trinity's a Mystery so high, that it rebates the sharpest edge of humane understanding, p. 83.

Obs. If this Mystery be so apparent in Scripture, why can they neither demonstrate it, nor clear it to themselves? We should desire no clearer demonstration then clear Scripture; surely whilst they cannot clear it (and their distinctions) to themselves, they are not like to clear them unto others; but instead of Scripture proof and demonstration, we must either acquiesce with what their humane understandings can produce from Aquinas, Wotton, and Aristotle, &c. or else we are like to be most bitterly railed against, by these our Opposers.

T.V. The three Holies, Isa. 6. 3. signifies the three persons, (Contradiction) the Lord of Hosts, the One God, pag. 33.

Contr. J.O. Contradicts T.V. pag. 45. where he saith, That of Isa. 6. 1, 2. three Holy, Holy Holy, is the Lord of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of his glory, applyed unto the Son, Joh. 12. 41, 42.

Obs. How palpably one Contradicts another; one saying the three Holies signifies three Persons; the other (viz. J.O.) saith, They are applied to the Son, who is but One. This Doctor Owen should correct his Brother Vincent.

T.V. The Son being Eternal, this Generation must be Eternal, the personal property of the Son is to be begotten, pag. 36.

Contr. T.V. They are three distinct persons from their distinct personal Acts, — (Contradiction again) Infinite is not applicable to the three distinct personalities, pag. 45. The Son of God is God, is infinite in Power, in Wisdom, and Goodness, and Eternal, pag. 30.

Obs. Here manifest Contradiction to himself, shews it self; as much as to say, That either the Son of God is eternal, and yet not infinite; or else, That the Son of God being eternal, is not a person distinct from God; if a Person be not infinite; but yet the Son of God is infinite in Power, Wisdom, Goodness, &c. How ever these can be reconciled, I leave to the ingenious to judge.

T.V. The Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, are three substances, pag. 13. 43. not three substances, pag. 13.

They are three distinct substantia, pag. 27. A person is one individual substantia rather, T.D. pag. 2.

Obs.

*Obs.* Here they are now put to it, what to call them, being not three substances, as *T. V.* saith, they call them three subsistences. But now it must be subsistents rather. But then in Contradiction to both, *Doctor Owen* saith, *The Holy Ghost is a substance, — a personal subsistence.* What differs now between substance and subsistence?

*T. D.* *What the Scripture hath revealed to us, concerning that distinction in the God-head, cannot be apprehended under any other Notion or Resemblance; which therefore we attribute to God, pag. 3. We know not what to call those three but persons.*

*Contr. T. D.* *Of the Father, Word, and Spirit, &c. (from 1 Joh. 1. 7.) Now all Witnesses, properly so called, are persons, pag. 5. — Then these Witnesses must needs be distinct, pag. 7.*

*Obs.* Why is not that Scripture produced all this while, if these be such, as reveal your distinctions and notion of persons in God? And, why do you not know what to call those three in Heaven but Persons, when *T. D.* knows how to call them Witnesses; What ignorance and Contradictions are here!

*T. V.* *From Matth. 3. 16, 17. Herein is a distinction of all the three persons; — The Son clothed in Flesh; The Spirit in the shape of a Dove; The Father in the Voice, &c. pag. 34.*

*Contr. W. M.* *The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being of an infinite Nature, are three Persons, — Co-essential, Co-equal, Co-eternal, pag. 29.*

*Contr. T. V.* *The Son being Eternal, his Generation must be Eternal; the personal property of the Holy Ghost is to proceed from the Father and the Son, pag. 36.*

*Obs. Quest.* But was Christ, being clothed with Flesh, or the Spirits appearing in the shape of a Dove, or being sent, from Eternity? are these pertinent proofs of their distinct personalities, which are reckoned Co-eternal? &c. And whether, or to-whom was the Spirit sent from Eternity?

*T. V.* *The Holy Ghost is God which W. R. doth deny, pag. 32. his denial of the Divinity of Christ is plain, pag. 28.*

*Contr. T. V.* *The Unity of the God-head is not denied by the Adversaries I have to do withal, pag. 28.*

*Obs.* So here the same person that is accused for denying the Divinity of Christ, is in these latter words cleared, as not denying that

that Unity of the God-head, and to be sure he doth confess the Father, the Word, and the Spirit to be One, being one Divine Substance, and so One God.

T. V. *The Son is God co-essential, co-equal, co-eternal with the Father, — Christ is infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness, eternal,* pag. 29, 30.

T. V. *In regard of his humane Nature, the Jewes speak truth, Joh. 8. 57. Thou art not yet fifty years old, as he was a Son of Abraham, and born many generations after him,* pag. 31.

Obs. Quest. And was not he a Person as he was a Son of Abraham, not fifty years old, if he was (as I never heard any yet deny, and your Doctrine supposes a Trinity of distinct Persons, as being co-eternal, co-equal, &c.) doth not this then render Christ (as a Son of Abraham) to be a fourth person?

## 2. Touching Pardon and Satisfaction.

T. V. *That God never doth, nor will, nor can pardon any sinner without Satisfaction made to his offended Justice for their sins, because his*

*Holliness, Righteousness, and Truth obligeth*  
\* That was not Christ. *him to take Vengeance upon all \* that have transgressed his Law,* pag. 54.

T. V. *Christ the eternal Son of God, the second person of this glorious Trinity, — the Doctrine of Satisfaction depending upon this person, — The Lord Jesus Christ proved to be God equal with the Father,* pag. 54.

Contrad. T. D. *Many of us do not affirm any impossibility of forgiving without Satisfaction; and for my part, though I know some worthy Persons do deny W. P's affirmative, yet I cannot join with them therein, for to me it is evident, that God is free in his Determinations, what Attribute he will manifest,* pag. 17, 18.

Contrad. T. V. *God proclaims himself to be gracious and merciful,* pag. 60. *He is exalted upon the Throne of his Mercy, ready to forgive*

\* Where then is the Impossibility in him for it? see *Math. 19. 26. Luk. 1. 37.*

*give \* sinners, pag. 60, 61. God was at the Charges of his own Satisfaction, Job 33. 24. pag. 62.*

Obs.



*Obj.* Then it appears, That God had Power to shew himself Gracious ( he willeth not the Death of sinners, but rather their return) and Merciful, ready to forgive sinners; (upon Repentance) he being at the Charges of his own Satisfaction (as is said) in giving his Eternal Son; who is confessed to be God equal with the Father; all which in the best sense amounts to this, That God satisfied himself with his own Gift, and without performing his own Will, he could not be satisfied; And who ever doubted, or made question or Controversie of that, if it were so taken; but this proves not their unscriptural terms, phrases, and notions of Law supposed in the case, nor yet that God took vengeance on Christ instead of all Transgressors, and they to go free, and yet still sin.

*T. V.* *It was necessary that the Person that should make Satisfaction should be a Man, because none but a Creature could suffer,* pag. 55. *Contr.* to the former

*Contrad. T. V.* *It being impossible for any finite Creature to make plenary Satisfaction to the infinite Justice of God which requireth an infinite Satisfaction,* pag. 54, 55. *If Christ had not been God as well as Man, the Sufferings and Satisfaction would have been but finite.*

*Obj.* First, This Person that should make satisfaction by suffering and death, it seems now is counted a Creature, which yet as such, could not satisfy infinite Justice (as Contradictorily is confessed) But as before it's said, He was the *Eternal Son of God*, *promised to be God, equal with the Father*; but now (in Contradiction) it was as *God and Man* that he satisfied, whereas it was not as *God* that he suffered and died; but we confess that God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself.

*T. V.* *Christ did bear the punishment of our sins (viz. the curse and punishment our sins deserved) that he might give Satisfaction unto God's Justice,* pag. 57, 58.

*Obj. Query.* But did God undergo that punishment? surely nay: Or, did Christ as man, undergo that eternal Punishment, Death, and Curse due to sinners? Could Christ's Death, or Temporal Sufferings be Eternal? Yet still we confess, That God both had, and hath still full satisfaction and pleasure in his Son Christ the Anointed, the Lamb that was offered without spot to God, a Sacrifice for sin, though your abuse of Christ, confusion and darkness

ness in stating your Matter we cannot own as proceeding from any sense or favour of Christ, either as a Sacrifice or Saviour.

T.V. *His Righteousness obligeth him to take vengeance upon all that have transgressed \* his Law, pag. 54. Our righteousness are as filthy Raggs.*

Contrad. T.V. *He doth Exercise his Justice freely as he doth love his Image in his people freely, pag. 65.*

Obs. Then your filthy Raggs cannot cover you from his vengeance, for therein you are not in his Image, which he loves freely in his People, and yet you would be accounted his People, where you are, it's high time for you to Repent, and no longer cover your selves with such Raggs, polluted Garments, — For God will lay you bare and naked.

### 3. Of Justification.

T.D. *There is no need of inherent Righteousness for Justification, — (Contradiction) — But yet there is need of it to make us meet for Heaven, Col. 1. 12. pag. 45.*

Contrad. *Inherent gives us a fitness for the enjoying of it; (is lying in Communion with God) without likeness of disposition; there can be no liking of each other, pag. 46.*

Obs. What then are persons in a Justified state while they are neither meet for Heaven, nor fit to enjoy it? nor yet partakers of that which makes like to God, and brings into Communion with him? Which is this inherent Righteousness of Christ (as it is called) which T.D. hath shut out as not needful for Justification, — contrary to plain Scripture, 1 Cor. 6. 11. Rom. 2. 13. Jam. 2. 21. Heb. 12. 14.

T.D. *Satisfaction is a compensation or recompence made to God for injury done him by sin, which may be both by doing and suffering — Vindictive Justice.*

Contrad. T.V. *Godliness is enjoyed upon all, pag. 67.*

Obs. How then did Christ undergo infinite Wrath from offended infinite Justice, that sinners and sin deserved, when he never sinned? For here every one is to obey, and answer the pure Law of God

God, *viz.* by *Godliness*; and if *Godliness* be enjoyned upon all, I ask, must all remain in a sinful ungodly state? and Commands to Perfection be construed but as *the measure of our duty*, according as *T. D.* saith, pag. 17. who formerly affirmed also, That the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, *was meant in Christ, and not in our persons*; so, then must we look on Christ as his being Godly, Righteous, Obedient to Death, for men, fully to satisfy and take off the Righteous Injunction laid upon them to Godliness, perfect Obedience, &c. That it is, to be meant, Christ must be perfect for us, he is to be only the subject of all those Commands enjoining perfect Obedience, Righteousness, and Holiness, and not we, which is as absurd, and all one as to say, That when God Commands us by his Grace not to sin, but to be perfect, (or perfectly to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live godly, soberly, &c.) — That he all this while intends his Son Jesus Christ as the subject of these Commands; And whereas he never said, *Son Jesus Christ, Do not thou sin, be not thou ungodly, do thou deny worldly lusts, live thou godly, soberly, be thou perfect for all, and it shall satisfy me fully, instead of Perfection or Righteousness in men, seeing none can be perfect or free from sin in this life, &c.* But this absurd Course, is the current, tenour, and intent of our Opposers Doctrine; And yet they must confess, That Christ never sinned, nor could sin, neither was there guile found in his mouth; so their presenting him only as the subject of perfect Obedience, and not Men, or Believers; is all one as to say, That all those Commands directed to us for that end, was only intended to Christ; for *T. D.* construes his Satisfaction and Payment [in men's stead] to consist in both Doing and Suffering, *viz.* Both in Christ's Obedience and Subjection to the Law, and God's Precepts; as also to *his Primitives and Curses*, pag. 19, 20. But *T. V.* layeth it upon *his Death in their room*; and thus they manifestly Contradict themselves, whereas God was alwayes well pleased or satisfied in Christ, both in his active obedience, and also in his passive subjection to suffering death (as man) even in all his whole Conversation, Ministry, Life and Death for Mankind, he being a perfect Sacrifice for sin, but God is not therefore satisfied with man out of Christ, or out of obedience to the Law of his Spirit, but as he comes to be found in Christ, having and possessing his Righteousness within, and the

Life and Effects thereof, which doth not admit of sin and imperfection: term of life, seeing as is Confessed by T.D. and T.V. That God loves his Image in his People freely, and without likeness of disposition, there can be no likening of each other; And surely the Image, likeness, and disposition of God in his People, is pure and perfect, which sin and imperfection bears no resemblance of.

T.V. No persons being the subjects of Gospel Justification, but as ungodly, that is, as having sinned.

Contrad. T. V. Where he removeth the guilt of sin, he also removeth the filth of sin; Justification and Sanctification being inseparable Companions, — Justification is never without Sanctification.

Obs. See the apparent Contradiction here in this latter to the former; for here note then, That no Persons are the subjects of Gospel Justification, as ungodly, or as in their sins; but as being sanctified, and the filth of sin removed; so then justified not in sin, but in the Truth and Righteousness of Christ; they being washed, cleansed, and sanctified; and only such are they that are Justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God, — 1 Cor. 6. 11.

T. D. Satisfaction is not a Scripture phrase, but the thing is found there, to wit, a Compensation made to God for the injury done him by our sin, which may be by doing, or suffering, or both, Justice that is Vindictive, pag. 19.

Contrad. T. D. Those places that speaks of the turning away of Divine Wrath by Christ's Obedience, which Wrath is but an Inclination to punish, pag. 22. — Christ's Obedience cannot properly work upon God's Will. [Contradiction again.]

Contrad. T. D. The Deliverer undergoes that Evil in kind or equivalently, which he that is Delivered, should have undergone, pag. 24.

Obs. What Evil was it that sinners deserved or should have undergone? do you not confess it was the Wrath and Vengeance of God, Hell, Everlasting Damnation, and Punishment from his just hand? And did Christ the Deliverer undergo all that! What a strange Object is he here rendred? and yet he was both God and (innocent) Man? But how doth this hold with that before, That it was but an Inclination to punish? What apparent Ignorance and Contradiction is here! And is this the great Glory, Power, Sovereignty, Divine Love, Mercy, and Goodness that you ascribe to the

the infinite God, to lay such a limit upon him, as that he could not forgive, pardon, or pass by former offences, without exacting not only full Payment, but Revenge and Punishment upon the Surety (*viz.* his innocent beloved Son) even the same in kind due to the Transgressors; whereas the Scripture saith, *The Chastisement of our Peace was upon him*: which is not the same with Everlasting Wrath and Vengeance from the immediate hand of God (which I cannot believe was so laid on Christ) whose Mercies are over all his Works, and particularly mankind, but his Wrath is revealed against all ungodliness.

*T. D.* Upon actual Faith he layeth aside his anger quite, and becomes our friend, pag. 33.

*Obs.* Then it appears his Anger is not quite laid aside, nor Friendship with him obtained till Actual Faith; How has *T. D.* overthrown and given away their Cause herein? Faith and Repentance must be Experienced, or else Anger is not quite laid aside.

*T. D.* Though the thing be true and owned by us, *viz.* That Christ could not satisfy God's Justice as Man, — or as God singly, p. 34.

*Obs.* Could not God satisfy himself! What a strange limitation is here laid upon the infinite God? And surely as *God-Man*, (as your term is) he was not under the same Evil, Wrath, or Everlasting Punishment, which was due to the Transgressors. For God did not deal so with himself, but he commended his Love to us in that while we were sinners Christ died for us, he died for our sins; but was raised for our Justification; it was Christ that died, ~~you~~ rather that he is risen again.

*T. D.* The Father's gift of the Son for our Redemption depends on nothing but himself, — Our Doctrine represents not the Son kinder than the Father, — The Father and Son as God, are equally kind to man, and equally angry at man's sin, p. 36, 37, 38.

*Obs.* If equally kind to man, then why did *T. F.* lay such an Impossibility on God of freely pardoning? [But then doth *T. D.* think he amends it, by considering God as a Creditor, and so as a private Person? pag. 32. Where proves he this in all the Scriptures?] And if the Father and Son be equally angry at man's sin, then man must Repent, and forsake his sins before their anger be wholly removed, or either fully pleased, or satisfied concerning man; For

where was there a third Person substituted to pacifie the Anger of both? Howbeit God was well pleased, and fully satisfied in Christ, and concerning all his Works, Sufferings, and Sacrifice, in order to man's Salvation; and we are accepted in the Beloved of God, for whose sake, and in whom we have received Remission, Righteousness, Life, and Peace with God, having received Christ (the Righteousness of God) for that end.

T. D. *A state of freedom from sin is not attainable in this life, and yet commanded, Match. 5. 48. and that no man ever did attain a state of Perfection, pag. 55. 57.*

All which Contradi& their Doctrine of Imperfection, and prove our Principle; and then their filthy Raggs of self-Righteousness, and best Performances, which are sinful, are shut out of both Union and Intimacy with Christ, as not proceeding from any true dependance upon him, or that Spirit and Truth wherein the True and Living God is Worshipped by all such as are of the true Circumcision.

T. D. Christ was not ashamed to call us Brethren, Heb. 2. 11. that is fellow-subjects, for being one in nature with us, he becomes one with us in an obligation, &c. pag. 20.

J. O. Christ gave himself for us, that he might Redeem us from all iniquity, 1 Pet. 1. 18. pag. 160. — It would altogether subvert the Holy God to pardon sinners that continue so to live and die in their sins, p. 179.

T. D. That Mystical Union betwixt Christ and his People, by their dependance upon him, in all the good they do, — is as near and intimate as that of the branches upon the Vine, by vertue of their natural Union in bearing fruit, pag. 47.



*Some Passages out of Edward Stillingfleet's  
Discourse of the Sufferings of Christ, which are  
evidently Contradictory to John Owen,  
and Tho. Danson.*

*In the Margent are J. Owen  
and T. Danson's Doctrines.*

**P**ages 269, & 270. 'The State  
'of the Controversie hath  
'been rendered more obscure by  
'the mistakes of some who have  
'managed it with greater zeal [a]  
'than judgment;— they have shot  
'over their Adversaries heads,  
'and laid their own more open to  
'Assaults. It is easie to observe,  
'That most of Socinus his Argu-  
'ments are Levelled against an  
'Opinion, which few, who have  
'considered those things do main-  
'tain, [b] and none need to think  
'themselves obliged to do it,  
'which is, That Christ paid a proper  
'and ridgid Satisfaction for the sins  
'of man, considered under the notion  
'of Debts, and that he paid the very  
'same which we ought to have done,  
'which in the sense of the Law is  
'never called Satisfaction, but  
'strict Payment; Against this  
'Socinus Disputes from the Im-  
'possibility of Christ's paying the

[a] *J. Owen.* For the term  
of Satisfaction,—the right un-  
derstanding of the word it  
self, depends on some Notions  
of Law, that as yet we  
need not take into Considera-  
tion, pag. 150:

[b] *J. O.* He (Christ) bare  
our sins, or the punishment  
due unto them, pag. 160. He  
answered the Law, and the  
penalty of it, pag. 161.

*T. D.* The deliverer under-  
goes the evil in kind, which  
he that is delivered should  
have undergone, pag. 24.

*Obs.* Here is as much opposi-  
tion between these men and Dr.  
Still. as if J. O. should say, It  
was the very same punishment,  
&c. but E. S. Nay; It was not  
the very same, &c.

'very

[c] T. D. Christ when he suffered was not Innocent, and when God required satisfaction of him, it was due from him, &c.

[d] J. O. God as supream Ruler, dispenseth not with the Act of Law, but the immediate object, and substitutes another Sufferer in the room of them who are principally lyable unto the sentence, &c.

[e] J. O. The Son of God — was upon the account of the Dignity of his Person, able to Answer the Penalty which all others had incurred.

[f] J. O. That God — did so lay our sins in and by the sentence of the Law upon him, &c. pag. 166.

[g] T. D. God admits of what Christ did on our behalf, as if it had been our personal

very same that we were to have paid, because our penalty was eternal death, — and that as the consequence of inherent Guilt, [e] which Christ neither did, nor could undergo. — If a Mediator could have paid the same, — then the Gospel had not been the bringing in of a better Covenant, but a performance of the Old, pag. 271. But if there be a Relaxation [d] or Dispensation of the first Law, then it necessarily follows, That what Christ paid, was not the very same which the first Law required; for what need of that, when the very same was paid that was in the Obligation. [e] But if it be said, That the dignity of the Person makes up what wanted in the kind or degree of punishment, this is a plain confession, That it is not the same, &c. [f] Besides, if the very same had been paid in the strict sense, there would have followed a deliverance *ipso facto*, for the Release immediately follows the payment of the same; and it had been Injustice to have required any thing further, in order to the discharge of the offender, when strict and full payment had been made of what was in the Obligation: [g] But we see that Faith and Repentance, and the Consequences of those two, are made

made Conditions on our parts, in order to the enjoying the benefit of what Christ hath procured; so that the Release is not immediate upon the Payment, &c.

Page 272. We are to consider that these very Persons assert, That Christ paid all for us, and in our name and stead; so that the payment by Christ was by a substitution in our room; and if he paid the same which the Law required, the benefit must immediately accrue to those in whose Name the Debt was paid; for what was done in the Name of another, is all one to the Creditor, as if it had been done by the Debtor himself; But above all things, it is impossible to reconcile the freeness of Remission, with the full Payment, &c. — Neither will it serve to say, *That though it was not free to Christ, yet it was to us:* for the Satisfaction and Remission must respect the same person, for Christ did not pay for himself, but for us; neither could the Remission be to him, &c. — It is impossible the same Debt should be fully paid, and freely forgiven; much less will it avoid the difficulty in this case to say, *That [h] it was a refusale Payment,* for it being supposed to be the very same, it was not in Justice refusale, &c.  
pag. 173.

Act, as the Creditor Cancels the Bond, lets the Debtor out of Prison, and gives him as Legal a Discharge upon the Sureties payment, &c.

Observe T.D's words below, whereupon, 1. I ask if refusale Payment, how then is God bound to take Vengeance, in T. V. his sense? 2. If another thing be paid, How agrees this with J. O? For,

[h] T. D. Supposes, That Satisfaction to be *Solutio recusabilis*, Refusale payment; — — — *dum alius solvit,*  
*alind solvitur;*

— When another Person then what was obliged makes payment, — another thing is paid, then what the Law required. —

Thus

‘ Thus when our Adversaries Dispute against this Opinion, no  
 ‘ wonder if they do it successfully; but this whole Opinion is  
 ‘ built upon a Mistake, That Satisfaction must be the payment of  
 ‘ the very same; which while they contend for, they give our Ad-  
 ‘ versaries too great an advantage, and make them think they  
 ‘ triumph over the Faith of the Church, when they do it only over

\* As J. O. T. D. & T. V.  
 they being the Mistakers.

‘ the mistake of some perticular  
 ‘ Persons, \* p. 275. They make the  
 ‘ right of punishment meerly to  
 ‘ depend on God’s absolute Do-  
 ‘ minion, and that all Satisfaction  
 ‘ must be considered under the  
 ‘ notion of Compensation for the  
 ‘ injuries done to him,— [b] But  
 ‘ if we can clearly shew a confi-  
 ‘ derable difference between the  
 ‘ Notion of Debts and Punish-  
 ‘ ments, if the right of Punish-  
 ‘ ments doth not depend upon  
 ‘ meer Dominion; and that Sa-

[h] T. D. That Christ made  
 a Compensation to God, for  
 the Injury done him by our  
 sin, which may be both by  
 doing and suffering Justice,  
 that is Vindictive.—

‘ tisfaction by way of Punishment, is not primarily intended for  
 ‘ Compensation.

‘ It is lawful for a man to forgive all the Debts which are owing  
 ‘ him, — although they assert, *That the Justice of God doth never*  
 ‘ *require Punishment in case of Repentance*; but withal they assert,  
 ‘ *That in case of Impenitency, it is not only agreeable, but due to the na-*  
 ‘ *ture and decrees, and therefore to the rectitude and equity of God not*  
 ‘ *to give Pardon*: If this be true, then there is an apparent diffe-  
 ‘ rence between the notion of Debts and Punishments, &c. Thus  
 for Edw. Stillingfleet.

Obs. Hereby the Reader may see how contrary to Dr. Owen and  
 T. Danson’s Notions of Law, Dr. Stillingfleet hath reasoned, and  
 hath seemed to shew more Moderation, and offer more Reason  
 (in his way and method) than they have done in these matters:  
 These Passages I was willing to Relate, that the World may see  
 how Inconsistent and Opposite these Doctors, and Learned men,  
 (so accounted) are in their Notions, and how they cannot agree  
 among

among themselves, and also what Confusion men are apt to run into, when they keep not to the plain language of the Scriptures; Besides had the despised Suffering *Quakers* but appeared (as from themselves) after this method against J. O. and his Brethren, as E. S. hath done, what an offence would it have been unto them, and how ready would they have been to muster up their Forces, and send out their reviling Books

\* against us, hoping thereby to gain the more favour and esteem, as, Defenders of the Faith of the Church, &c. whereas, it is not the Faith of the Church they defend in their mistakes, whereby they have obscured the state of the Controversie, by managing it with more Zeal than Judgment; according to E. S. his words: Now they may Answer themselves in their Contradictions, and see if they can Reconcile their own Work, before they further meddle against others; for in the state they are in, the more they strive, the more they'll Confound themselves, and work their own overthrow. As for their Reviling and nick-Names they give men, that differ, they are but poor Arguments for Confutation, when they are rather to prejudice the Ignorant, than to manifest Truth. Howbeit, whatever men's Notions, or Opinions be, touching Christ or his Sufferings, we have

not our Religion and Experience thereof from them, they being uncertain, and weak, in comparison of the Living Truth it self, which in Christ and his Light, is received; and not in men's

\* For which—see their railing Language [as Black-mouthed Blasphemers, biddous Blasphemers, with Socinian and damnable Heretical Opinions, &c.] used by T. V. ] They may receive a Check from Dr. Stillingfleet, to the Reader, viz. 'It may be some will be dissatisfied, that I give our Adversaries no harder Names; but I never found any men convinced by ill Language; and those we have to deal withal, are so subtil, not to distinguish between loud Clamours and Demonstrations. I leave that Method of Confuting them, to those who have greater Abilities in that way. I think it very Incongruous for us, while we Magnifie the Patience and Meekness of Christ in his Sufferings, to discover our Passion, in Disputing about them.

Traditions and Notions : And that all may come to know the certain Principle or Light of Christ within, to wait in, to know the Power of Godliness, and those things which concern Life and Salvation: This is the desire of my Soul, for all such as feel a want of true Satisfaction and Peace in their own Souls.

---

*Some Passages of Edward Stillingfleet's Sermons  
Preached before the King, March 13. 1666<sup>6</sup>, which  
was Printed by his special command.*

[a] T. Danson. *Christ when he Suffered was not Innocent, and when God required Satisfaction of him, it was due from him; Christ was guilty of our sin, when he Suffered for it, Synopsis pag. 36. Christ was made sin by Imputation, therefore, so are we made Righteous, pag. 40.*

[a] 'H<sup>E</sup> who hath appointed  
'the Rewards - and  
'Punishments of the great Day,  
'will then call the Sinner to Ac-  
'compt, not only for all his other  
'sins, but for offering to lay the  
'Imputation of them upon him-  
'self.

'We have the greatest reason  
'to lay the blame of all our Evil  
'Actions upon our selves, as to  
'attribute the Glory of all our  
'Good unto himself, pag. 16, 17.

[b] 'That God had designed  
'(they are ready to say) That  
'man should lead a life free from  
'sin; Why did he confine the  
'Soul of man to a Body so apt to  
'taint and pollute it? But, who  
'art thou, O man, that doth find  
'fault with thy Maker? &c.  
'pag. 17.

[b] 'He



[6] 'He hath offered us the assistance of his Grace, and of that Spirit of his, which is greater than that Spirit which is in the World; He hath promised us those Weapons, whereby we may withstand the Torrent of Wickedness in the World; we have not only sufficient means of Resistance, but we understand the Danger before hand, pag. 19.

[6] 'Their Consciences still rebuke them sharply for their sins, then in a mighty rage and fury, they charge God himself with Tyranny, as laying impossible Laws upon the Souls of men. But if we either consider the Nature of the Command, or the Promises which accompany it, or the large Experience to the contrary, we shall easily discover that this Pretence is altogether unreasonable; for, what is it that God requires of men, as the Condition of their future Happiness, which in its own Nature is judged Impossible? Is it for men to live Soberly, Righteously, Godly, in this World? for that was the end of Christian Religion, &c. Is it to do as we would be done by? Is it to maintain a Universal Kindness and Good Will to men? That indeed is the great Excellency of our Religion, that it so strictly requires it; but if this be impossible, farewell all good Nature in the World, pag. 21, 22.

[6] 'Their own mouths will Condemn them, when they charge God with laying impossible Laws upon Mankind. --- Yet such is the unlimited Nature of Divine Goodness, and the exceeding Riches of God's Grace, that he makes a large and free offer of Assistance to all those who are so senseable of their own infirmity, as to beg it of him: And can men then say the Command is impossible, when he hath promised an assistance suitable to the nature of the Duty, and infirmities of men? pag. 23. --- Hath he not made use of the most obliging motives to persuade us to the Practice of what he requires, by the infinite discovery of

[6] T. D. *A State of freedom from sin is not attainable in this life; --- No man ever did attain a State of Perfection (viz. none of the eminently Holy Persons in the Scripture)* pag. 55. *Yet Perfection is commanded; --- Be ye therefore perfect as your Heavenly Father, &c. Mat. 5. 48. Such Commands are the measure of our Duty, not of our Attainments,* pag. 57.

\* his own Love, the Death of his Son, and the Promise of his Spirit; and what then is wanting, but only setting our selves with a serious Obedience to them, to make his Commands not only not impossible, but easie to us, pag. 24. Thus far E.S.

*Obj.* Here observe, That E.S. hath Asserted Truth, contrary to the *Presbyterians* and *Independants*:

1st. On the behalf of the Freeness and Sufficiency of God's Grace to Mankind, for the Fulfilling or Obeying of God's Commands.

2dly. In his Asserting the Possibility of man's Obeying them thereby, which amounts to Perfection and Freedom from Sin, as being attainable by those Divine Helps that God affords man for that end.

3dly. In Reproving them, that being sharply rebuked in their Consciences for sin, do charge God with laying impossible Lawes on men, which is no less than to charge him with Cruelty, or Tyranny.

## The CONCLUSION.

*The sum of the Controversie between us and our present Opposers, consists in these following Heads.*

1st. **F**irst, I Affirm, That their distinguishing the Deity, or God-head into Three separate (or finite) Personalities; and to reckon the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost not Infinite, is Antiscriptural, Erroneous, and Blasphemous.

2dly. That their Affirming Christ not to be Innocent but Guilty of our sins when he Suffered (is Blasphemous) and so their deeming, that the Suffering he underwent, was the same Revenge or Vengeance from God (which they term *Vindictive Justice*) that's due

due to Wicked men, Reprobate Angels, and Devils (this is false also) and that upon that ground, their stating the matter of Satisfaction to Divine Justice, as otherwise, It being impossible for God to Pardon, &c. All this is to charge God with Injustice and Cruelty against his Innocent Son, and is, in the first place, Blasphemous against Christ; and in the next, its Impious, to the dishonour of both Father and Son.

3dly. Their Affirming Christ but to have died but for a few, and not for all men; and that his being a Propitiation, or Sacrifice, is but for some of all sorts (of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*) and not for the sins of the whole World, is contrary to plain Scripture, and repugnant to the free Grace and gift of God to all.

4thly. Their Affirming, That Christ doth not enlighten every man with a spiritual saving Light, but with a natural insufficient Light; is an Erroneous Doctrine of Darkness, and Antichrist, and repugnant both to Christ, and God's free Grace, and Love in him to Mankind.

5thly. Their Affirming Perfection, or freedom from sin, not to be attainable in this Life; and so their arguing for sin term of Life, is Antichristian, and of the Devil; being against the Commands and Promises of God, and against the Power and Coming of Christ, and frustrates the end of his Suffering, Sacrifice, and Manifestation.

6thly. Their Notion of Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, to impure, sinful, rebellious Persons, who are not partakers of it in themselves, nor yet in that Faith which purifies the heart; and thereupon their reckoning them Righteous in God's account, is a false Notion, and none of God's, nor Christ's Imputation; but as Gross, Erroneous, and Impious, as their imputing sin to Christ as not being Innocent when he Suffer'd, but Guilty, &c.

7thly. And their Affirming men to be Justified, or in a Justified state, by an Imputed Righteousness, whilst actually sinful and unjust; is as false, and as great abomination, as he that Justifieth the Wicked, and he that Condemneth the Just; or as they are that Condemn Christ as not being Innocent, and Justifie sinful men (or Hypocrites) as being Righteous, whose Faith is but empty, dead, and feigned.

8thly. So their Affirming men to be *Imputatively* Righteous, when inherently and actually sinful; or *Imputatively* saved, when actually damned: And all their Doctrines that tend to dishonour God, or Christ, and to give People ease and liberty in sin, are to be denied as Erroneous, Antichristian, and Devillish.

*And here in opposition to our Ridgid Opposers, both those of Presbyterians and Independants (concerned in these Doctrines) I further Affirm as followeth;*

*First,* That the Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit (or the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) are *One*, and inseparable; no where in Scripture called Three separate Persons, nor finite in Personalities; though three [in manifestation] and so testified of (as Three Witnesses) for the Confirmation of the Testimony of the Gospel.

*Secondly,* That Christ was *Innocent* and not *Guilty* when he Suffered (he was *Just* that Suffered for the *Unjust*) seeing he freely, in the Love of God to man, gave and offered himself, by the Eternal Spirit, a Lamb without spot to God; so that he was an *Offering well pleasing*, a sweet smelling savour, and so a most acceptable and satisfactory *Sacrifice* to God for all men.— It being also possible for God, and he doth Pardon men upon Repentance for Christ's sake, without either accounting Christ not Innocent or Guilty of men's sins, and without either exercising the same Rigour of Punishment, Eternal Death, or Vengeance upon him, that's due to Reprobates and Devils: For it was in one and the same Love, mutual Condescension, and a Spirit of Compassion and Forgiveness, both in the Father and in the Son, towards Mankind, that Christ was given a Ransom, or in which (as it's said) God sent his Son; and Christ gave himself, &c.

*Thirdly,*

*Thirdly*, That Christ gave himself a Ransom for *all men*, and by the Grace of God \* tasted Death for every man, being a Propitiation for the sins of the whole World, to shew forth, and give Testimony of God's Love and Grace towards all Mankind.

*Fourthly*, That Christ enlightens every man that cometh into the World, with a spiritual saving Light, which they that believe in, and follow, do receive Life in him the true Light (how ever Darkness oppose or deny it) and they that reject, or hate his Light, are condemned, and left without excuse before the Lord by it.

*Fifthly*, That Perfection and freedom from sin, is attainable in this Life to *all* that believe in the Power of Christ for that end, what ever the Devil and his Ministers say to the contrary.

*Sixthly*, That while Persons are impure or sinful, not experiencing the Work of God in them, nor the Living Faith in it's Operation, nor Sanctification in them, God doth not impute Christ's Righteousness to them, nor reckon it theirs, they being out of it in the Unregenerate state, not come to know the Image of God renewed in them; for men are not imputedly Righteous when actually sinners (as impiously hath been Asserted) nor imputedly saved, when actually damned, no more then imputatively Saints, while actually Devils.

*Seventhly*, Neither doth God account men Justified, or reckon them Righteous, whilst they are really unjust, being reprov'd and judg'd as Unrighteous by his Light and Spirit in them; for God's accompts and reckonings are true and Righteous, and he Just and True in all his wayes, and his Judgments are Right, and he can no more therein Contradict his own Light, in Man, or it's Judgment and Testimony, than he can oppose or deny himself.

*Eighthly*, The Unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God; and the Wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men; they that are (or continue) actually sinful and polluted, are neither acquitted nor Righteous in God's account, but must bear their Iniquity, which will

will be their ruine, unless they Return and be reconciled in their minds to the Light of Christ within (which reproves them of sin and evil) and so except men Repent and forsake their sins, they shall surely perish; they that neglect the great Salvation, cannot escape Condemnation. — *If I sin against thee, then thou markest me, and thou wilt not acquit me from mine Iniquity*, Job 10. 14. Psal. 32. God imputes sin to none, but them in whom it is in being; so he imputes not Righteousness to any, but them in whom it is; as the blessed man, to whom God imputeth not sin, &c. in his Spirit there is no guile.

*Finally*, All that profess to be Ministers of the Gospel, and Teachers of others, ought to Preach or Teach nothing but what may make, or tend to the Glory of God, and Honour of Christ Jesus, in the Exaltation of Truth and Righteousness in the Earth, and all the Contrary (as all sin and sinful Doctrines, with all sin-pleasing and sinners-soothing Principles) to be abhorred, rejected, and opposed by all professing Christianity, that tender the Honour of Christ, and desire the Exaltation of his Kingdom, which stands in Righteousness.

---



